

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 104

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 5, 1955

Mr. ENGLE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

A BILL

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That the purpose of this Act is to encourage State and local
4 participation in the development of projects under the Federal
5 reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in
6 the development of similar projects in the seventeen western
7 reclamation States by non-Federal organizations.

8 SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

9 (a) The term “construction” shall include rehabilitation
10 and betterment.

1 (b) The term "Federal reclamation laws" shall mean
2 the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amend-
3 atory thereof or supplementary thereto.

4 (c) The term "organization" shall mean a State or a
5 department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a
6 conservancy district, irrigation district, water users' associa-
7 tion, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar
8 organization which has capacity to contract with the United
9 States under the Federal reclamation laws.

10 (d) The term "project" shall mean (i) any reclama-
11 tion or irrigation undertaking or a self-contained unit of
12 such an undertaking or a rehabilitation and betterment pro-
13 gram for an existing irrigation project, authorized to be con-
14 structed pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws and (ii)
15 any similar undertaking proposed to be constructed by an
16 organization. The term "project" shall not include any
17 such undertaking, unit or program the cost of which exceeds
18 \$5,000,000.

19 (e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of
20 the Interior.

21 SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of
22 the benefits provided in this Act shall submit a proposal
23 therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he
24 shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by

1 a payment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining
2 the proposal.

3 SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construc-
4 tion of a project which has not theretofore been authorized for
5 construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set
6 forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail
7 comparable to those included in preauthorization reports re-
8 quired for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been
9 submitted for review by the State or States in which the proj-
10 ect is located in like manner as provided in subsection (c),
11 section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887),
12 except that the review may be limited to the State or States
13 in which the project is located; and shall include a proposed
14 allocation of capital costs to functions such that costs for
15 facilities used for a single purpose shall be allocated to that
16 purpose and costs for facilities used for more than one pur-
17 pose shall be so allocated among the purposes served that
18 each purpose will share equitably in the costs of such joint
19 facilities.

20 (b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that
21 the organization already holds or can acquire all lands
22 and interests in land (except public and other lands and
23 interests in land owned by the United States which are within
24 the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject

1 to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water neces-
2 sary for the successful construction, operation, and mainte-
3 nance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing
4 to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this Act
5 such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall
6 include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and
7 rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have
8 advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided*, That the
9 contribution required of any applicant organization shall not
10 be in excess of 25 per centum of the costs of the project
11 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclama-
12 tion project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable
13 functions under general provisions of law applicable to such
14 projects and, in the case of rehabilitation and betterment
15 projects, any existing irrigation facilities owned by the ap-
16 plicant organization may be pledged as all or part of any
17 contribution so required.

18 (c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the
19 Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appro-
20 priate State agency designated by him) to be financially
21 feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the
22 requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the pro-
23 visions of this Act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to
24 negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as pro-
25 vided in section 5; but no such contract shall be executed by

1 the Secretary prior to sixty calendar days (which sixty days,
2 however, shall not include days on which either the House
3 of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of
4 an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain)
5 from the date on which the project proposal has been sub-
6 mitted to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs
7 of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided,*
8 That the said submission may, after the close of any session
9 of the Congress, be made to the chairman and ranking minor-
10 ity member of the said committees and in that event, or in
11 the event that the sixty-day period aforesaid is broken by
12 an adjournment of the Congress, the contract shall not be
13 executed until the expiration of sixty calendar days from
14 the date of such submission or from the date of its original
15 submission to the committees as hereinbefore provided. The
16 Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to
17 Congress or at the time of his determination that the re-
18 quested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the pro-
19 visions of this Act, may reserve from use or disposition
20 inimical to the project any lands and interests in land
21 owned by the United States which are within his adminis-
22 trative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and
23 which are required for use by the project. Any such reser-
24 vation shall expire at the end of two years unless the repay-

1 ment contract provided for in section 5 of this Act shall have
2 been executed.

3 (d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to
4 financial feasibility, emergency or urgent need for the project,
5 whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irriga-
6 tion water for an existing irrigation project, whether the pro-
7 posal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project
8 works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irri-
9 gation or drainage. All project works and facilities con-
10 structed under this Act, except such portions that are dedi-
11 cated to flood control or other functions which would in the
12 case of a Federal reclamation project be considered non-
13 reimbursable, shall remain under the jurisdiction and control
14 of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of
15 the repayment contract.

16 SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under
17 the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this Act shall,
18 except as otherwise provided in this Act, conform to the
19 provisions of the Federal reclamation laws with respect to
20 repayment contracts entered into by irrigation districts and
21 the delivery of water thereunder and shall set out, among
22 other things—

23 (a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made
24 to the organization and the time and method of making
25 the same available to the organization. Said loan shall

1 not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project
2 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclama-
3 tion project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable
4 functions under general provisions of law applicable to
5 such projects;

6 (b) the maximum amount of any grant to be
7 accorded the organization and the time and method of
8 paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall
9 not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of construct-
10 ing the project which, if it were being constructed as a
11 Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable
12 to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions
13 of law applicable to such projects;

14 (c) a plan of repayment by the organization of the
15 sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the
16 date when the principal benefits of the project first be-
17 come available and, in the case of any project involving
18 an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water
19 supply, or power produced as an element of the project
20 and incidental to its full development, of interest on the
21 unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the
22 loan at the average rate of interest, as determined by the
23 Secretary of the Treasury, paid on the long-term interest-
24 bearing marketable securities of the United States out-

standing at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on which the contract is executed;

(d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable functions is made, in accordance with regulations with respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal department or agency primarily concerned with those functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such regulations, for operation by the United States or for repayment to the United States of the amount of any such grant; and

(e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as aforesaid. The liability of the United States under any contract entered into pursuant to this Act shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the same, and every such contract shall so recite.

SEC. 6. Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project which has theretofore been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall be made in like manner as a proposal under section 4 of this Act, but the Secretary may waive such requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of that section as he finds to be duplicative of, or rendered unnecessary or impossible by, action already taken

1 by the United States. Upon approval of any such proposal
2 by the Secretary he may negotiate and execute a contract
3 which conforms, as nearly as may be, to the provisions of
4 section 5 of this Act.

5 SEC. 7. Upon request of an organization which has
6 made or intends to make a proposal under this Act, the
7 head of any Federal department or agency may make avail-
8 able to the organization any existent engineering, economic,
9 or hydrologic information and printed material that it may
10 have and that will be useful in connection with the planning,
11 design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the
12 project concerned. The cost of any plans, specifications, and
13 other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pur-
14 suant to this section and the cost of making and administer-
15 ing any loan under this Act shall, to the extent that they
16 would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project con-
17 structed under the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as
18 a loan and covered in the provisions of the contract entered
19 into under section 5 of this Act unless they are otherwise
20 paid for by the organization.

21 SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized to perform any
22 and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as
23 may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions
24 of this Act.

25 SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated,

1 such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,-
2 000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act. All such
3 appropriations shall remain available until expended and
4 shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under
5 this Act, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove
6 provided.

7 SEC. 10. This Act shall be a supplement to the Federal
8 reclamation laws.

A BILL

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

By Mr. ENGLE

JANUARY 5, 1955

Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular
Affairs

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 384

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 5, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

A BILL

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the purpose of this Act is to encourage State and
4 local participation in the development of projects under
5 the Federal reclamation laws and to provide for Federal
6 assistance in the development of similar projects in the
7 seventeen western reclamation States by non-Federal
8 organizations.

9 SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

10 (a) The term “construction” in addition to its usual

1 meaning under the Federal reclamation laws shall include
2 rehabilitation and betterment.

3 (b) The term "Federal reclamation laws" shall mean
4 the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amend-
5 atory thereof or supplementary thereto.

6 (c) The term "organization" shall mean a State or a
7 department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a
8 conservancy district, irrigation district, water users' asso-
9 ciation, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar
10 organization which has capacity to contract with the United
11 States under the Federal reclamation laws.

12 (d) The term "project" shall mean (i) any undertaking
13 or feature or unit of an undertaking, having an estimated
14 cost of not to exceed \$5,000,000, authorized to be constructed
15 under the Federal reclamation laws, the sole or principal
16 purpose of which is to store, divert, carry, or deliver water
17 for irrigation or for domestic, industrial, or municipal use
18 or to furnish pumping energy therefor or to drain lands
19 under or susceptible of irrigation, and (ii) any other similar
20 undertaking or feature or unit of an undertaking, having an
21 estimated cost of not to exceed \$5,000,000, proposed to be
22 constructed by an organization.

23 (e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of
24 the Interior.

25 SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of

1 the benefits provided in this Act shall submit a proposal
2 therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he
3 shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by
4 a payment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining
5 the proposal.

6 SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construc-
7 tion of a project which has not theretofore been authorized for
8 construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set
9 forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail
10 comparable to those included in preauthorization reports re-
11 quired for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been
12 submitted for review by the State or States in which
13 the project is located in like manner as provided in sub-
14 section (c), section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944
15 (58 Stat. 887), except that the review may be limited to
16 the State or States in which the project is located; and shall
17 include a proposed allocation of capital costs to functions
18 such that costs for facilities used for a single purpose shall
19 be allocated to that purpose and costs for facilities used for
20 more than one purpose shall be so allocated among the pur-
21 poses served that each purpose will share equitably in the
22 costs of such joint facilities.

23 (b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that
24 the organization already holds or can acquire all lands
25 and interests in land (except public and other lands and

1 interests in land owned by the United States which are within
2 the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject
3 to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water neces-
4 sary for the successful construction, operation, and mainte-
5 nance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing
6 to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this Act
7 such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall
8 include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and
9 rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have
10 advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided*, That the
11 contribution required of any applicant organization shall not
12 be in excess of 25 per centum of the costs of the project
13 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation
14 project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable func-
15 tions under general provisions of law applicable to such proj-
16 ects and, in the case of rehabilitation and betterment proj-
17 ects, any existing irrigation facilities owned by the applicant
18 organization may be pledged as all or part of any contribu-
19 tion so required.

20 (c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the
21 Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appro-
22 priate State agency designated by him) to be financially
23 feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the
24 requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the pro-
25 visions of this Act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to

1 negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as pro-
2 vided in section 5. Such contract shall not be executed,
3 when Congress is in session, until the expiration of sixty
4 calendar days after the project proposal and the proposed
5 contract shall have been submitted to the Committees on
6 Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representa-
7 tives and Senate, or when Congress is not in session,
8 until the expiration of sixty days after submission thereof
9 to the chairman and ranking minority member of each such
10 committee: *Provided*, That prior to submission of any
11 project proposal, the Secretary shall afford the applicant
12 organization an opportunity to comment in writing on the
13 conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary with
14 respect to the project proposal, and such written comments
15 of the applicant organization shall be included in the
16 matter submitted to the Committees on Interior and Insular
17 Affairs, or to the chairman and ranking minority members
18 thereof, as hereinbefore provided.

19 (d) The Secretary at the time of submitting the project
20 proposal to Congress at the time of his determination that
21 the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the
22 provisions of this Act, may reserve from use or disposition
23 inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned
24 by the United States which are within his administrative

1 jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and which are
2 required for use by the project. Any such reservation shall
3 expire at the end of two years unless the repayment contract
4 provided for in section 5 of this Act shall have been executed.

5 (e) The Secretary shall give due consideration to
6 financial feasibility, emergency or urgent need for the project,
7 whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irriga-
8 tion water for an existing irrigation project, whether the
9 proposal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project
10 works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for
11 irrigation or drainage. All project works and facilities con-
12 structed under this Act shall remain under the ownership and
13 control of the local contracting organization subject to the
14 terms of the contract entered into pursuant to section 5 of
15 this Act.

16 SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under
17 the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this Act shall
18 set out, among other things—

19 (a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made
20 to the organization and the time and method of making
21 the same available to the organization. Said loan shall
22 not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project
23 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclama-
24 tion project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable

1 functions under general provisions of law applicable to
2 such projects;

3 (b) the maximum amount of any grant to be
4 accorded the organization and the time and method of
5 paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall
6 not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of construct-
7 ing the project which, if it were being constructed as a
8 Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable
9 to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions
10 of law applicable to such projects;

11 (c) a plan of repayment by the organization of the
12 sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the
13 date when the principal benefits of the project first be-
14 come available and, in the case of any project involving
15 an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water
16 supply, or power produced as an element of the project
17 and incidental to its full development, of interest on the
18 unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the
19 loan at the average rate of interest, as determined by
20 the Secretary of the Treasury, paid on the long-term
21 interest-bearing marketable securities of the United
22 States outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year
23 preceding the date on which the contract is executed;

24 (d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant

1 predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable
2 functions is made, in accordance with regulations with
3 respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal
4 department or agency primarily concerned with those
5 functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such
6 regulations, for operation by the United States or for
7 repayment to the United States of the amount of any
8 such grant; and

9 (e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem
10 necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security
11 for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as afore-
12 said. The liability of the United States under any con-
13 tract entered into pursuant to this Act shall be contin-
14 gent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out
15 the same, and every such contract shall so recite.

16 SEC. 6. Upon request of an organization which has
17 made or intends to make a proposal under this Act, the
18 head of any Federal department or agency may make avail-
19 able to the organization any existent engineering, economic,
20 or hydrologic information and printed material that it may
21 have and that will be useful in connection with the planning,
22 design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the
23 project concerned. As agreed upon, the reasonable cost
24 of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material
25 furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the

1 reasonable cost of making and administering any loan under
2 this Act shall, to the extent that they would not be non-
3 reimbursable in the case of a project constructed under the
4 Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered
5 in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 5
6 of this Act unless they are otherwise paid for by the
7 organization.

8 SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform any
9 and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may
10 be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this
11 Act.

12 SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated,
13 such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,-
14 000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act. All appro-
15 priations authorized for the purpose of this Act shall remain
16 available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used
17 to finance loans made under this Act, be reimbursable in the
18 manner hereinabove provided.

19 SEC. 9. This Act shall be a supplement to the Federal
20 reclamation laws.

A BILL

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

By Mr. MULLER of Nebraska

JANUARY 5, 1955

Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular
Affairs

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 164

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 6, 1955

Mr. WATKINS introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

A BILL

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the purpose of this Act is to encourage State and local
4 participation in the development of projects under the Fed-
5 eral reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in
6 the development of similar projects in the seventeen western
7 reclamation States by non-Federal organizations.

8 SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

9 (a) The term “construction”, in addition to its usual

1 meaning under the Federal reclamation laws, shall include
2 rehabilitation and betterment.

3 (b) The term "Federal reclamation laws" shall mean
4 the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amend-
5 atory thereof or supplementary thereto.

6 (c) The term "organization" shall mean a State or a
7 department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a
8 conservancy district, irrigation district, water users' associa-
9 tion, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar
10 organization which has capacity to contract with the United
11 States under the Federal reclamation laws.

12 (d) The term "project" shall mean (i) any undertaking
13 or feature or unit of an undertaking, having an estimated
14 cost of not to exceed \$5,000,000, authorized to be con-
15 structed under the Federal reclamation laws, the sole or prin-
16 cipal purpose of which is to store, divert, carry, or deliver
17 water for irrigation or for domestic, industrial, or municipal
18 use or to furnish pumping energy therefor or to drain lands
19 under or susceptible of irrigation, and (ii) any other similar
20 undertaking or feature or unit of an undertaking, having an
21 estimated cost of not to exceed \$5,000,000 proposed to be
22 constructed by an organization.

23 (e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of
24 the Interior.

25 SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the

1 benefits provided in this Act shall submit a proposal therefor
2 to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall pre-
3 scribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a pay-
4 ment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining
5 the proposal.

6 SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construc-
7 tion of a project which has not theretofore been authorized
8 for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set
9 forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail
10 comparable to those included in preauthorization reports re-
11 quired for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been
12 submitted for review by the States of the stream basin in
13 which the project is located in like manner as provided in
14 subsection (c), section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944
15 (58 Stat. 887), and shall include a proposed allocation of
16 capital costs to functions such that costs for facilities used
17 for a single purpose shall be allocated to that purpose and
18 costs for facilities used for more than one purpose shall be
19 so allocated among the purposes served that each purpose
20 will share equitably in the costs of such joint facilities.

21 (b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that
22 the organization already holds or can acquire all lands
23 and interests in land (except public and other lands and
24 interests in land owned by the United States which are
25 within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and

1 subject to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water
2 necessary for the successful construction, operation, and
3 maintenance of the project and that it is ready, able, and will-
4 ing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this
5 Act such portion of the cost of construction (which portion
6 shall include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and
7 rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have
8 advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided*, That the
9 contribution required of any applicant organization shall not
10 be in excess of 25 per centum of the costs of the project
11 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation
12 project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable func-
13 tions under general provisions of law applicable to such proj-
14 ects and, in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects,
15 any existing irrigation facilities owned by the applicant or-
16 ganization may be pledged as all or part of any contribution
17 so required.

18 (c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the
19 Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appro-
20 priate State agency designated by him) to be financially
21 feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the
22 requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the
23 provisions of this Act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to
24 negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as pro-

1 vided in section 5: *Provided*, That, with respect to projects
2 having an estimated cost in excess of \$200,000, no such
3 contract shall be executed until the project proposal and the
4 proposed contract shall have been approved by Act of Con-
5 gress. The Secretary at the time of submitting the project
6 proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination
7 that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under
8 the provisions of this Act, may reserve from use or disposi-
9 tion inimical to the project any lands and interests in land
10 owned by the United States which are within his adminis-
11 trative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and
12 which are required for use by the project. Any such reser-
13 vation shall expire at the end of two years unless the repay-
14 ment contract provided for in section 5 of this Act shall
15 have been executed.

16 (d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to
17 financial feasibility, emergency or urgent need for the project,
18 whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irriga-
19 tion water for an existing irrigation project, whether the pro-
20 posal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project
21 works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irri-
22 gation or drainage. All project works and facilities con-
23 structed under this Act shall remain under the ownership

1 and control of the local contracting organization subject to
2 the terms of the contract entered into pursuant to section 5
3 of this Act.

4 SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under
5 the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this Act shall
6 set out, among other things—

7 (a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made
8 to the organization and the time and method of making
9 the same available to the organization. Said loan shall
10 not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project
11 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclama-
12 tion project, would be properly allocable to reim-
13 bursable functions under general provisions of law
14 applicable to such projects;

15 (b) the maximum amount of any grant to be
16 accorded the organization and the time and method of
17 paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall
18 not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of con-
19 structing the project which, if it were being constructed
20 as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly
21 allocable to nonreimbursable functions under general
22 provisions of law applicable to such projects;

23 (c) a plan of repayment by the organization of the
24 sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the

1 date when the principal benefits of the project first be-
2 come available and, in the case of any project involving
3 an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water
4 supply, or power produced as an element of the project
5 and incidental to its full development, of interest on the
6 unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the
7 loan at the average rate of interest, as determined by the
8 Secretary of the Treasury paid on the long-term interest-
9 bearing marketable securities of the United States out-
10 standing at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the
11 date on which the contract is executed;

12 (d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant
13 predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable
14 functions is made, in accordance with regulations with
15 respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal
16 department or agency primarily concerned with those
17 functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such
18 regulations, for operation by the United States or for
19 repayment to the United States of the amount of any
20 such grant; and

21 (e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem
22 necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security
23 for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as afore-
24 said. The liability of the United States under any con-

1 tract entered into pursuant to this Act shall be contin-
2 gent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out
3 the same, and every such contract shall so recite.

4 SEC. 6. Upon request of an organization which has
5 made or intends to make a proposal under this Act, the
6 head of any Federal department or agency may make avail-
7 able to the organization any existing engineering, economic,
8 or hydrologic information and printed material that it may
9 have and that will be useful in connection with the planning,
10 design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the
11 project concerned. As agreed upon, the reasonable cost
12 of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material
13 furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and
14 the reasonable cost of making and administering any loan
15 under this Act shall, to the extent that they would not be
16 nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under
17 the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and cov-
18 ered in the provisions of the contract entered into under sec-
19 tion 5 of this Act unless they are otherwise paid for by the
20 organization.

21 SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform any
22 and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be
23 necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

24 SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
25 such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,000,-

1 000 to carry out the provisions of this Act. All appropria-
2 tions authorized for the purposes of this Act shall remain
3 available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used
4 to finance loans made under this Act, be reimbursable in the
5 manner hereinabove provided.

6 SEC. 9. This Act shall be a supplement to the Federal
7 reclamation laws.

A BILL

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

By Mr. WATKINS

JANUARY 6, 1955

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior
and Insular Affairs

IN THE SENATE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

January 10, 1906.

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE
MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTIMATES, FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1907,
AS PRESENTED TO THE SENATE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
IN JANUARY, 1906.

A BILL

TO SUPPLEMENT THE MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTIMATES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1907,
AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE PAYMENT OF THE SAME.

Enacted by the Senate of the District of Columbia, January 10, 1906.

Approved by the House of Representatives, January 10, 1906.

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 405

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 14, 1955

Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. BIBLE) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

A BILL

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the purpose of this Act is to encourage State and local
4 participation in the development of projects under the Federal
5 reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in
6 the development of similar projects in the seventeen western
7 reclamation States by non-Federal organizations.

8 SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

1 (a) The term “construction” shall include rehabilitation
2 and betterment.

3 (b) The term “Federal reclamation laws” shall
4 mean the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts
5 amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

6 (c) The term “organization” shall mean a State or a
7 department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a
8 conservancy district, irrigation district, water users’ associa-
9 tion, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar
10 organization which has capacity to contract with the United
11 States under the Federal reclamation laws.

12 (d) The term “project” shall mean (i) any reclamation
13 or irrigation undertaking or feature or unit of an under-
14 taking, including incidental features thereof, having an esti-
15 mated cost of not to exceed \$5,000,000, authorized by the
16 Federal reclamation laws, or constructed by the United
17 States pursuant to said laws, or in connection with which
18 there is a repayment contract executed by the United States,
19 pursuant to said laws, or any undertaking or feature or unit
20 of an undertaking constructed or operated and maintained
21 by the Secretary through the Bureau of Reclamation for the
22 reclamation of arid lands or other purposes, and (ii) any
23 similar undertaking or feature or unit of an undertaking
24 having an estimated cost of not to exceed \$5,000,000 pro-
25 posed to be constructed by an organization.

1 (e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of
2 the Interior.

3 SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the
4 benefits provided in this Act shall submit a proposal therefor
5 to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall pre-
6 scribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a pay-
7 ment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining the
8 proposal.

9 SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construc-
10 tion of a project which has not theretofore been authorized
11 for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set
12 forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail
13 comparable to those included in preauthorization reports re-
14 quired for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been
15 submitted for review by the State or States in which the proj-
16 ect is located in like manner as provided in subsection (c),
17 section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887),
18 except that the review may be limited to the State or States
19 in which the project is located; and shall include a proposed
20 allocation of capital costs to functions such that costs for
21 facilities used for a single purpose shall be allocated to that
22 purpose and costs for facilities used for more than one pur-
23 pose shall be so allocated among the purposes served that each
24 purpose will share equitably in the costs of such joint
25 facilities.

1 (b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that
2 the organization already holds or can acquire all lands
3 and interests in land (except public and other lands and
4 interests in land owned by the United States which are within
5 the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject
6 to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water neces-
7 sary for the successful construction, operation, and mainte-
8 nance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing
9 to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this Act
10 such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall
11 include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and
12 rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have
13 advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided*, That the
14 contribution required of any applicant organization shall not
15 be in excess of 25 per centum of the costs of the project
16 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation
17 project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable func-
18 tions under general provisions of law applicable to such
19 projects and, in the case of rehabilitation and betterment
20 projects, any existing irrigation facilities owned by the appli-
21 cant organization may be pledged as all or part of any con-
22 tribution so required.

23 (c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the
24 Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appro-
25 priate State agency designated by him) to be financially

1 feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the
2 requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the pro-
3 visions of this Act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to
4 negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as pro-
5 vided in section 5. Such contract shall not be executed,
6 when Congress is in session, until the expiration of sixty
7 calendar days after the project proposal shall have been sub-
8 mitted to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of
9 the House of Representatives and Senate, or, when Con-
10 gress is not in session, until the expiration of sixty days after
11 submission thereof to the chairman and ranking minority
12 member of each such committee: *Provided*, That prior to
13 submission of any project proposal, the Secretary shall afford
14 the applicant organization an opportunity to comment in
15 writing on the conclusions and recommendations of the Sec-
16 retary with respect to the project proposal, and such written
17 comments of the applicant organization shall be included in
18 the matter submitted to the Committees on Interior and
19 Insular Affairs, or to the chairman and ranking minority
20 members thereof, as hereinbefore provided.

21 (d) The Secretary at the time of submitting the proj-
22 ect proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination
23 that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under
24 the provisions of this Act, may reserve from use or disposi-

tion inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within his administrative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and which are required for use by the project. Any such reservation shall expire at the end of two years unless the repayment contract provided for in section 5 of this Act shall have been executed.

(e) The Secretary shall give due consideration to financial feasibility, emergency or urgent need for the project, whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irrigation water for an existing irrigation project, whether the proposal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irrigation or drainage. All project works and facilities constructed under this Act shall remain under the ownership and control of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of the contract entered into pursuant to section 5 of this Act.

SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this Act shall set out, among other things—

(a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project

1 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclama-
2 tion project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable
3 functions under general provisions of law applicable to
4 such projects;

5 (b) the maximum amount of any grant to the
6 accorded the organization and the time and method of
7 paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall
8 not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of construct-
9 ing the project which, if it were being constructed as a
10 Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable
11 to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions
12 of law applicable to such projects;

13 (c) a plan of repayment by the organization of the
14 sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the
15 date when the principal benefits of the project first be-
16 come available and, in the case of any project involving
17 an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water
18 supply, or power produced as an element of the project
19 and incidental to its full development, of interest on the
20 unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the
21 loan at the average rate of interest, as determined by the
22 Secretary of the Treasury, paid on the long-term interest-
23 bearing marketable securities of the United States out-
24 standing at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the
25 date on which the contract is executed;

1 (d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant
2 predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable
3 functions is made, in accordance with regulations with
4 respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal
5 department or agency primarily concerned with those
6 functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such
7 regulations, for operation by the United States or for
8 repayment to the United States of the amount of any
9 such grant; and

10 (e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem
11 necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security
12 for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as afore-
13 said. The liability of the United States under any con-
14 tract entered into pursuant to this Act shall be contingent
15 upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the
16 same, and every such contract shall so recite.

17 SEC. 6. Upon request of an organization which has
18 made or intends to make a proposal under this Act, the
19 head of any Federal department or agency may make avail-
20 able to the organization any existent engineering, economic,
21 or hydrologic information and printed material that it may
22 have and that will be useful in connection with the planning,
23 design, construction, or operation and maintenace of the
24 project concerned. As agreed upon, the reasonable cost of
25 any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material

1 furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the
2 reasonable cost of making and administering any loan under
3 this Act shall, to the extent that they would not be nonre-
4 imburseable in the case of a project constructed under the
5 Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered
6 in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 5
7 of this Act unless they are otherwise paid for by the
8 organization.

9 SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform any
10 and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as
11 may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions
12 of this Act.

13 SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated,
14 such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,-
15 000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act. All appro-
16 priations authorized for the purposes of this Act shall remain
17 available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used
18 to finance loans made under this Act, be reimbursable in the
19 manner hereinabove provided.

20 SEC. 9. This Act shall be a supplement to the Federal
21 reclamation laws.

A BILL

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

By Mr. MALONE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. KITCHEL,
Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. BAR-
RETT, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. BIBLE

JANUARY 14, 1955

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior
and Insular Affairs

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3817

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 8, 1955

Mr. YOUNG introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

A BILL

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the purpose of this Act is to encourage State and local
4 participation in the development of projects under the Fed-
5 eral reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance
6 in the development of similar projects in the seventeen
7 western reclamation States by non-Federal organizations.

8 SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

9 (a) The term “construction” shall include rehabilitation
10 and betterment.

1 (b) The term “Federal reclamation laws” shall mean
2 the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amenda-
3 tory thereof or supplementary thereto.

4 (c) The term “organization” shall mean a State or a
5 department, agency, or political subdivision thereof, or a
6 conservancy district, irrigation district, water users’ associ-
7 ation, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar
8 organization which has capacity to contract with the United
9 States under the Federal reclamation laws.

10 (d) The term “project” shall mean (i) any reclamation
11 or irrigation undertaking or feature or unit of an under-
12 taking, including incidental features thereof, having an esti-
13 mated cost of not to exceed \$5,000,000, authorized by the
14 Federal reclamation laws, or constructed by the United
15 States pursuant to said laws, or in connection with which
16 there is a repayment contract executed by the United States,
17 pursuant to said laws, or any undertaking or feature or unit
18 of an undertaking constructed or operated and maintained
19 by the Secretary through the Bureau of Reclamation for the
20 reclamation of arid lands or other purposes, and (ii) any
21 similar undertaking or feature or unit of an undertaking
22 having an estimated cost of not to exceed \$5,000,000 pro-
23 posed to be constructed by an organization.

24 (e) The term “Secretary” shall mean the Secretary of
25 the Interior.

1 SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the
2 benefits provided in this Act shall submit a proposal therefor
3 to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall pre-
4 scribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a pay-
5 ment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining the
6 proposal.

7 SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construc-
8 tion of a project which has not theretofore been authorized
9 for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set
10 forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail
11 comparable to those included in preauthorization reports re-
12 quired for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been
13 submitted for review by the State or States in which the
14 project is located in like manner as provided in subsection
15 (c), section 1, of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat.
16 887), except that the review may be limited to the State or
17 States in which the project is located; and shall include a
18 proposed allocation of capital costs to functions such that
19 costs for facilities used for a single purpose shall be allocated
20 to that purpose and costs for facilities used for more than one
21 purpose shall be so allocated among the purposes served that
22 each purpose will share equitably in the costs of such joint
23 facilities.

24 (b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that
25 the organization already holds or can acquire all lands

1 and interests in land (except public and other lands and
2 interests in land owned by the United States which are within
3 the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject
4 to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water neces-
5 sary for the successful construction, operation, and mainte-
6 nance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing
7 to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this Act
8 such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall
9 include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and
10 rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have
11 advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided*, That the
12 contribution required of any applicant organization shall not
13 be in excess of 25 per centum of the costs of the project
14 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation
15 project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable func-
16 tions under general provisions of law applicable to such
17 projects and, in the case of rehabilitation and betterment
18 projects, any existing irrigation facilities owned by the appli-
19 cant organization may be pledged as all or part of any con-
20 tribution so required.

21 (c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the
22 Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appro-
23 priate State agency designated by him) to be financially
24 feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the
25 requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the pro-

visions of this Act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as provided in section 5. Such contract shall not be executed, when Congress is in session, until the expiration of sixty calendar days after the project proposal shall have been submitted to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and Senate, or, when Congress is not in session, until the expiration of sixty days after submission thereof to the chairman and ranking minority member of each such committee: *Provided*, That prior to submission of any project proposal, the Secretary shall afford the applicant organization an opportunity to comment in writing on the conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary with respect to the project proposal, and such written comments of the applicant organization shall be included in the matter submitted to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, or to the chairman and ranking minority members thereof, as hereinbefore provided.

(d) The Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this Act, may reserve from use or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within his administrative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and which

1 are required for use by the project. Any such reservation
2 shall expire at the end of two years unless the repayment
3 contract provided for in section 5 of this Act shall have
4 been executed.

5 (e) The Secretary shall give due consideration to
6 financial feasibility, emergency or urgent need for the project,
7 whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irriga-
8 tion water for an existing irrigation project, whether the pro-
9 posal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project
10 works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irri-
11 gation or drainage. All project works and facilities con-
12 structed under this Act shall remain under the ownership
13 and control of the local contracting organization subject to
14 the terms of the contract entered into pursuant to section 5
15 of this Act.

16 SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under
17 the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this Act shall
18 set out, among other things—

19 (a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made
20 to the organization and the time and method of making
21 the same available to the organization. Said loan shall
22 not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project
23 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclama-
24 tion project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable

1 functions under general provisions of law applicable to
2 such projects;

3 (b) the maximum amount of any grant to be
4 accorded the organization and the time and method of
5 paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall
6 not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of construct-
7 ing the project which, if it were being constructed as a
8 Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable
9 to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions
10 of law applicable to such projects;

11 (c) a plan of repayment by the organization of the
12 sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the
13 date when the principal benefits of the project first be-
14 come available and, in the case of any project involving
15 an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water
16 supply, or power produced as an element of the project
17 and incidental to its full development, of interest on the
18 unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the
19 loan at the average rate of interest, as determined by the
20 Secretary of the Treasury, paid on the long-term interest-
21 bearing marketable securities of the United States out-
22 standing at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the
23 date on which the contract is executed;

(d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable functions is made, in accordance with regulations with respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal department or agency primarily concerned with those functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such regulations, for operation by the United States or for repayment to the United States of the amount of any such grant; and

(e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as aforesaid. The liability of the United States under any contract entered into pursuant to this Act shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the same, and every such contract shall so recite.

SEC. 6. Upon request of an organization which has made or intends to make a proposal under this Act, the head of any Federal department or agency may make available to the organization any existent engineering, economic, or hydrologic information and printed material that it may have and that will be useful in connection with the planning, design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the project concerned. As agreed upon, the reasonable cost of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material

1 furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the
2 reasonable cost of making and administering any loan under
3 this Act shall, to the extent that they would not be nonre-
4 imburseable in the case of a project constructed under the
5 Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered
6 in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 5
7 of this Act unless they are otherwise paid for by the
8 organization.

9 SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform any
10 and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as
11 may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions
12 of this Act.

13 SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated,
14 such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,-
15 000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act. All appro-
16 priations authorized for the purposes of this Act shall remain
17 available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used
18 to finance loans made under this Act, be reimbursable in the
19 manner hereinabove provided.

20 SEC. 9. This Act shall be a supplement to the Federal
21 reclamation laws.

A BILL

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

By Mr. Young

FEBRUARY 8, 1955

Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular
Affairs

A BILL

For the purpose of providing a means for the
transfer of the property of the
United States and the proceeds of
the sale of the same to the States

Be it enacted

That the

1900

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 20, 1955
For actions of April 19, 1955
84th-1st, No. 64

CONTENTS

Achievement award.....27	Foreign aid.....1,19	Property.....12,34
Acreage allotments.....8	Foreign trade.....18	Reclamation.....2,7,22
Administrative expenses.....28	Forestry.....1,12	Roads.....1,31
Appropriations.....1,4,28	Holiday.....35	School lunch.....1
Buildings and grounds.....12	Labor.....25	States' rights.....34
Cotton.....20	Lands.....12	Sugar.....17
Dairy industry.....10,13,16	Livestock and meats.....16,32	Tariffs.....18
Disaster relief.....8,33	Loans, farm.....8	Taxation.....32
Disease and pest control.....1	Marketing.....26	Technical assistance.....1
Education.....34	Natural resources.....10,24	Trade agreements.....9
Electrification, rural.....10,23	Penalty mail.....6	Transportation.....32,34
Family farms.....10	Personnel.....1,3,11,20,27,30	Treaties.....34
Farm program.....10,21	Postal service.....6,15	Water utilization.....5
Farm relief.....8	Price supports.....14	Wheat referendum.....29
Food, surplus.....12		Wind erosion control.....1

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on supplemental appropriation bill. Senate debated Colorado reclamation project. House subcommittee voted for bill to authorize loans to non-Federal reclamation projects. Senate committee voted on various provisions of trade agreements bill. Sens. Russell, Stennis, and Johnston criticized USDA's adverse attitude on bill to provide additional acreage allotments in freeze areas. Rep. Betts introduced and discussed bill to eliminate 15-acre requirement for wheat-referendum vote.

HOUSE

1. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 4903 (H. Rept. 426) (pp. 3985-6). The conferees agreed to \$650,000 for disease and pest control (House, \$500,000; Senate, \$700,000); eliminated the \$7,000,000 Senate item for the school lunch program; reported in disagreement the Senate amendment to reimburse the President's disaster fund for wind erosion control under ACP; agreed to transfer of \$6,500,000 for the UN technical assistance program (House, \$4,000,000; Senate, \$8,000,000); agreed to \$3,500,000 for forest highways (House, \$3,000,000; Senate, \$4,000,000); and agreed to \$7,500,000 for unemployment compensation for Federal employees (Senate, \$13,000,000).
The bill also provides \$2,570,000 for forest-pest control and makes ARS and FS appropriations available for uniform allowances.

2. RECLAMATION. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report to the full Committee H. R. 104, to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects and non-Federal participation in Federal projects (p. D306).

Rep. Hosmer spoke in favor of using more of the West's water for industrialization and less emphasis on reclamation for agricultural purposes (pp. 4012-15).

3. PERSONNEL. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 4644, the postal-pay bill (pp. 4000-1).
4. TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956. House conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 4876 (p. 3981). Senate conferees have been appointed.
5. RIVER DEVELOPMENT. Rep. Trimble criticized Budget Circular A-47, relating to allocation of costs of river projects under the Corps of Engineers (pp. 4020-2).
6. PENALTY MAIL. Both Houses received from the Post Office Department a proposed bill to repeal the requirement for departments to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year; to Committees on Post Office and Civil Service (pp. 4025, 3898-9).

SENATE

7. RECLAMATION. Continued debate on S. 500, to authorize the Colorado reclamation project (pp. 3911-80). Sen. Bennett inserted a letter from Secretary Benson on the need for additional agricultural land (p. 3973).
8. FARM RELIEF; ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS; FARM LOANS. Sens. Russell, Stennis, and Johnston criticized the Department for recommending against S. 1628, which would provide additional acreage allotments to farmers whose crops are damaged by the weather, etc., including the recent freeze; stated that the Department should have recommended an alternative solution to the problem; and objected to the increase to 5% in the interest rate on certain farm loans (pp. 3909-11).
9. TRADE AGREEMENTS. The Finance Committee voted on various provisions of H. R. 1, the trade agreements bill, including a provision to continue the program until June 30, 1958 (pp. D303-4).
10. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Humphrey inserted a Farmers Union Central Exchange (St. Paul) resolution regarding the dairy program, family farm policy, farm program, rural electrification, natural resources, etc. (pp. 3901-2).
11. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report S. 1094, to remove the appropriation limitation on Federal employees' uniform allowances (p. D304).
12. FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY. The Legislative Reporting Staff has obtained a supply of S. Doc. 32 (Apr. 13, 1955), "Inventory Report on Federal Real Property in the U. S. as of December 31, 1953, Prepared by General Services Administration at the Request of the Committee on Appropriations of the U. S. Senate."

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

13. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Rep. Johnson, Wisc., inserted 3 Collier's magazine articles, "Milk 12 Cents a Quart," discussing problems facing dairy farmers and consumers on the selling and consumption of milk; and stated that he hoped that the House Agriculture Dairy Subcommittee "will soon have some authoritative information on these problems..." (pp. A2571-4).

4/26/55

12. RECLAMATION; ~~PUBLIC LANDS; ALASKA~~. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendments H. R. 104, to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; and H. R. 603, to remove certain conditions relating to the law granting additional public lands for the support and maintenance of the University of Alaska (p. D337).
Rep. Hosmer spoke against the Colorado River reclamation project, and stated, "When the warehouses...are busting with \$8 billion worth of surplus food and fiber, the Bureau of Reclamation wants Congress to authorize a gigantic loss to the taxpayers...so that a desert project can be built to grow more surplus food" (pp. 4367-8).
13. STATEHOOD. The Rules Committee cleared for consideration and granted a closed rule providing for 7 hours of general debate on H. R. 2535, to admit Alaska and Hawaii into the Union (p. D338).
14. MONOPOLIES. Passed without amendment H. R. 4954, to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the U. S. to recover damages under the antitrust laws and to establish a uniform statute of limitations. The bill fixes the statute of limitations at 4 years and provides that the act shall take effect 6 months after its enactment. (pp. 4353-6, 4362-7.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

15. TVA. Sen. Hill inserted excerpts from a lecture by A. J. Wagner, Gen. Mgr., TVA, outlining some of the benefits derived from operations of the TVA including research activities and the experimental production of fertilizers (pp. A2745-6).
Sen. Kefauver inserted correspondence between himself and Rep. Gwinn discussing the major arguments against TVA and the rebuttal to these arguments (pp. A2746-7).
16. FORESTRY; CONSERVATION. Rep. Johnson (Wis.) inserted a constituent's letter discussing the problems confronting conservationists in the State of Wisconsin, with particular regard to the prairie grouse (p. A2761).
17. IRRIGATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Budge expressing the concern felt by people of his district toward the Hells Canyon Dam proposal and stating that "water for the irrigation of farmlands...is vital to the economy..." and inserting an Eastern Idaho Farmer editorial on this subject (p. A2764).
18. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Johnson (Wis.) inserted a Wisconsin Electric Cooperative resolution outlining the development of our Federal power policy and opposing "current efforts to weaken and destroy that Federal power policy" (p. A2766).

BILLS INTRODUCED

19. DAIRY PRODUCTS; MARKETING. S. 1803, by Sen. Wiley, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 so as to remove domestic trade barriers affecting milk and milk products; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 4301). Remarks of author (p. 4302).
20. BUDGET. S. 1805, by Sen. McClellan, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the U. S.; to Government Operations Committee (p. 4301). Remarks of author (pp. 4302-5).

21. ACCOUNTING. S. 1806, by Sen. McClellan, to amend sec. 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 720); to Government Operations Committee (p. 4301). Remarks of author (pp. 4305-6).
22. LANDS; IRRIGATION. S. 1818, by Sen. Hayden (for himself and Sen. Goldwater), to limit the amount of land on Federal irrigation projects which may be exchanged under the act of Aug. 13, 1953; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 4302).
23. ELECTRIFICATION. S. 1823, by Sen. Lehman (for himself and others), to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes; to Public Works Committee (p. 4302). Remarks of Sen. Lehman (pp. 4308-9).
24. CROP INSURANCE. S. 1826, by Sen. Clements, "to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended;" to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 4302).
25. FORESTRY. S. 1832, by Sen. Watkins, establishing a National Youth Rehabilitation Corps to provide for the rehabilitation of youthful delinquents through a program of service in connection with the preservation and protection of the natural resources of the Nation, such program to include general educational, vocational, and military training; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee (p. 4302). Remarks of author (pp. 4309-11).
26. PERSONNEL. H. R. 5843, by Rep. Davis, Ga., to provide leave of absence for officers and employees stationed outside the U. S. for use in the U. S., its Territories or possessions; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 4374).
H. R. 5862, by Rep. Watts, to confer jurisdiction upon U. S. district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation; to Judiciary Committee (p. 4374).
27. EDUCATION. H. R. 5846, by Rep. Hays, Ark., to extend and improve the program of assistance under Public Law 874, 81st Cong., to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities; to Education and Labor Committee (p. 4374).
28. FARM LOANS. H. R. 5848, by Rep. Jones, Ala., to reduce the interest rate from 5 percent to 3 percent on certain emergency loans made by the Farmers' Home Administration; to Agriculture Committee (p. 4374).
29. PENALTY MAIL. H. R. 5856, by Rep. Murray, Tenn., to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 4374).

BILL APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

30. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. S. 752, which amends the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to eliminate the requirement that private stocks exported thereunder be replaced from CCC stocks. Approved Apr. 25, 1955 (Public Law 25, 84th Congress).

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5881

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 27, 1955

Mr. ENGLE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

A BILL

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the purpose of this Act is to encourage State and local
4 participation in the development of projects under the Federal
5 reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in
6 the development of similar projects in all forty-eight States
7 and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska by non-Federal
8 organizations.

9 SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

1 (a) The term “construction” shall include rehabilita-
2 tion and betterment.

3 (b) The term “Federal reclamation laws” shall mean
4 the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amend-
5 atory thereof or supplementary thereto.

6 (c) The term “organization” shall mean a State or a
7 department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a
8 conservancy district, irrigation district, water users’ associa-
9 tion, an agency created by interstate compact, or’ similar
10 organization which has capacity to contract with the United
11 States under the Federal reclamation laws.

12 (d) The term “project” shall mean (i) any complete
13 irrigation undertaking or distinct unit of such an undertak-
14 ing or a rehabilitation and betterment program for an exist-
15 ing irrigation project, authorized to be constructed pursuant
16 to the Federal reclamation laws and (ii) any similar under-
17 taking proposed to be constructed by an organization. The
18 term “project” shall not include any such undertaking, unit,
19 or program the cost of which exceeds \$5,000,000: *Provided*,
20 That projects, the estimated cost of which is more than
21 \$5,000,000 but less than \$10,000,000, may qualify under
22 this Act if the applicant organization is ready, able, and will-
23 ing to finance otherwise than by loan or grant under this
24 Act all costs in excess of the amount of the loan or grant
25 which would be made under this Act if the estimated con-

1 struction cost were \$5,000,000: *And provided further*, That
2 nothing contained in this definition shall preclude the mak-
3 ing of a grant not in excess of \$5,000,000 in accordance with
4 the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of this Act, to organiza-
5 tions which qualify for the same and which are not applicants
6 for a loan under this Act.

7 (e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of
8 the Interior.

9 (f) The term "State" or "States" shall include the Ter-
10 ritories of Hawaii and Alaska.

11 SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of
12 the benefits provided in this Act shall submit a proposal
13 therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he
14 shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by
15 a payment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining
16 the proposal.

17 SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construc-
18 tion of a project which has not theretofore been authorized for
19 construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set
20 forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail
21 comparable to those included in preauthorization reports re-
22 quired for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been
23 submitted for review by the State or States in which the proj-
24 ect is located in like manner as provided in subsection (c),
25 section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887),

1 except that the review may be limited to the State or States
2 in which the project is located if the proposal is one for
3 rehabilitation and betterment of an existing project only; and
4 shall include a proposed allocation of capital costs to func-
5 tions such that costs for facilities used for a single purpose
6 shall be allocated to that purpose and costs for facilities used
7 for more than one purpose shall be so allocated among the
8 purposes served that each purpose will share equitably in
9 the costs of such joint facilities.

10 (b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that
11 the organization already holds or can acquire all lands
12 and interests in land (except public and other lands and
13 interests in land owned by the United States which are within
14 the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject
15 to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water neces-
16 sary for the successful construction, operation, and mainte-
17 nance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing
18 to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this Act
19 such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall
20 include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and
21 rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have
22 advised is proper in the circumstances.

23 (c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the
24 Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appro-
25 priate State agency designated by him) to be financially

1 feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the
2 requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the pro-
3 visions of this Act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to
4 negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as pro-
5 vided in section 5; but no such contract shall be executed by
6 the Secretary prior to sixty calendar days (which sixty days,
7 however, shall not include days on which either the House
8 of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of
9 an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain)
10 from the date on which the project proposal has been sub-
11 mitted to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs
12 of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided,*
13 That the said submission may, after the close of any session
14 of the Congress, be made to the chairman and ranking minor-
15 ity member of the said committees and in that event, or in
16 the event that the sixty-day period aforesaid is broken by
17 an adjournment of the Congress, the contract shall not be
18 executed until the expiration of sixty calendar days from
19 the date of such submission or from the date of its original
20 submission to the committees as hereinbefore provided. The
21 Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to
22 Congress or at the time of his determination that the re-
23 quested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the pro-
24 visions of this Act, may reserve from use or disposition

1 inimical to the project any lands and interests in land
2 owned by the United States which are within his adminis-
3 trative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and
4 which are required for use by the project. Any such reser-
5 vation shall expire at the end of two years unless the repay-
6 ment contract provided for in section 5 of this Act shall have
7 been executed.

8 (d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to
9 financial feasibility, emergency, or urgent need for the project,
10 whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irriga-
11 tion water for an existing irrigation project, whether the pro-
12 posal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project
13 works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irri-
14 gation or drainage. All project works and facilities con-
15 structed under this Act, except such portions that are dedi-
16 cated to flood control or other functions which would in the
17 case of a Federal reclamation project be considered non-
18 reimbursable, shall remain under the jurisdiction and control
19 of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of
20 the repayment contract.

21 SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under
22 the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this Act shall
23 set out, among other things—

24 (a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made
25 to the organization and the time and method of making

1 the same available to the organization. Said loan shall
2 not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project
3 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclama-
4 tion project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable
5 functions under general provisions of law applicable to
6 such projects;

7 (b) the maximum amount of any grant to be
8 accorded the organization and the time and method of
9 paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall
10 not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of construct-
11 ing the project which, if it were being constructed as a
12 Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable
13 to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions
14 of law applicable to such projects;

15 (c) a plan of repayment by the organization of
16 (1) the sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from
17 the date when the principal benefits of the project first
18 become available; (2) interest, at the average rate, as de-
19 termined by the Secretary of the Treasury, paid on the
20 long-term interest-bearing marketable securities of the
21 United States outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal
22 year preceding the date on which the contract is executed,
23 on that pro rata share of the loan which is attributable to
24 furnishing irrigation benefits in each particular year to
25 land held in private ownership by any one owner in

1 excess of one hundred and sixty irrigable acres; and
2 (3) in the case of any project involving an allocation
3 to domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or
4 commercial power produced as an element of the project
5 and incidental to its full development, interest on the
6 unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the
7 loan at a rate as determined in (2) above;

8 (d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant
9 predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable
10 functions is made, in accordance with regulations with
11 respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal
12 department or agency primarily concerned with those
13 functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such
14 regulations, for operation by the United States or for
15 repayment to the United States of the amount of any
16 such grant; and

17 (e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem
18 necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security
19 for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as afore-
20 said. The liability of the United States under any con-
21 tract entered into pursuant to this Act shall be contingent
22 upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the
23 same, and every such contract shall so recite.

24 SEC. 6. Any proposal with respect to the construction of
25 a project which has theretofore been authorized for construc-

tion under the Federal reclamation laws shall be made in like manner as a proposal under section 4 of this Act, but the Secretary may waive such requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of that section as he finds to be duplicative of, or rendered unnecessary or impossible by, action already taken by the United States. Upon approval of any such proposal by the Secretary he may negotiate and execute a contract which conforms, as nearly as may be, to the provisions of section 5 of this Act.

SEC. 7. Upon request of an organization which has made or intends to make a proposal under this Act, the head of any Federal department or agency may make available to the organization any existent engineering, economic, or hydrologic information and printed material that it may have and that will be useful in connection with the planning, design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the project concerned. The cost of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the cost of making and administering any loan under this Act shall, to the extent that they would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 5 of this Act unless they are otherwise paid for by the organization.

1 SEC. 8. The planning and construction of projects under-
2 taken pursuant to this Act shall be subject to all procedural
3 requirements and other provisions of the Act of August 14,
4 1946 (60 Stat. 1080).

5 SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to perform any
6 and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as
7 may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions
8 of this Act.

9 SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropri-
10 ated, such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,-
11 000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act. All such
12 appropriations shall remain available until expended and
13 shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under
14 this Act, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove
15 provided.

16 SEC. 11. This Act shall be a supplement to the Federal
17 reclamation laws.

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5881

A BILL

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

By Mr. ENGLE

APRIL 27, 1955

Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular
Affairs

7. CIVIC AUDITORIUM. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 1825, creating a commission to plan a D. C. civic auditorium (p. 4609).
8. RECLAMATION; LOANS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported H. R. 5881, to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects and for non-Federal cooperation in Federal projects (p. D368).
9. SALT-WATER RESEARCH. The Rules Committee ordered reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 2126, to expand the salt-water research program (p. D368).
10. IMPORTS. The Ways and Means Committee ordered reported H. R. 5560, making permanent the existing privilege of free importation of personal and household goods under Government orders, and H. R. 5675, continuing through June 1958 the suspension of import taxes on copper (p. D369).
11. POSTAL PAY. The conferees agreed to report a revised version of S. 1, the postal pay bill (pp. D369-70).
12. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. The revision of H. R. 2851, as ordered reported by the House Agriculture Committee, provides as follows: Requires CCC to make available to HEW, for providing emergency assistance to the needy, agricultural commodities and products (including cereals and cereal products) acquired through price support operations. Authorizes CCC to pay processing and other charges up to the time of delivery to central locations in States. Upon certifications of the Labor Department and the Governors as to need, directs HEW to make such commodities and products available to State agencies. Provides that CCC make Sec. 416 commodities available without compensation and that HEW reimburse CCC for other commodities at the acquisition cost or current support price (whichever is lower) plus the costs of processing, etc. Provides that CCC expenditures under this bill may be made in advance of appropriations and shall be entered as accounts receivable.
13. EXPORT-IMPORT BANK. H. Doc. 150 (Apr. 20) is a proposed increase in the amount of \$300,000 in the limitation on expenses (to provide for additional staff and other expenses required for a growing workload) for the fiscal year 1956 for the Export-Import Bank of Washington.
14. SOIL CONSERVATION. The amendments by Sen. Holland and others to H. R. 1573, to repeal the ACP-acreage allotments tie-in, (see Digest 71), would exempt from the present ACP-acreage allotments tie-in farmers harvesting corn for ensilage, wheat in an amount not in excess of 15 acres, a commodity or a crop on which producers have rejected marketing quotas in a referendum, or peanuts for seed to be used for the raising of peanuts for hogs. The amendments would also require applicants to establish their eligibility for payments in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation.

SENATE

15. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Continued debate on H. R. 1, the trade agreements extension bill (pp. 4620-1, 4631, 4634-43, 4645-97), and agreed to limit debate on bill and that no nongermane amendment will be received (p. 4621). Sens. Beall, Morse, O'Mahoney, and Humphrey submitted amendments to be proposed to this bill.

During debate on this bill Sen. Malone stated that "H. R. 1 is an economic Yalta," and that, "Farmers, too, ... will be an early target of the global free trade agency, as will producers of milk, butter, cheese, and other farm commodities" (pp. 4648-51). Sen. Malone also spoke in favor of giving

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

May 5, 1955
May 4, 1955
84th-1st, No. 73

CONTENTS

Animal disease.....13	Imports.....5,10	Reclamation.....2,20,27
Appropriations....11,23,30	Item veto.....23	Research.....3
Banking and currency....22	Legislative program....9	Reserve manpower.....9
Barley.....10	Livestock and meat....14	Roads.....15
Budget.....23,24,28	Loans.....22	Rye.....10
CCC.....12	Minerals.....5	Seed.....18
Claims.....12	Organization, executive.6	Small business.....16
Committees.....14	Peanuts.....1	Tobacco.....4,21
Commodity exchanges....12	Personnel.....19	Trade agreements.....10
Electrification.....25	Poultry.....14	Transportation.....21
Farm credit.....14	Prices, support....1,9,26	Treaties.....15
Family farm.....14	Property.....8	Water.....3
Farm program.....29	Purchasing.....7	Wheat.....18
Forestry.....11,17		

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated price support bill, agreeing to amendment making peanuts nonbasic. House committee reported bill for Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects. House subcommittee approved measure for USDA study of burley tobacco program. Senate passed trade agreements bill. Senate made Interior appropriation bill, which includes FS items, its pending business. Senate committee reported bills to give CEA subpoena power and protect purchasers of fungible goods from CCC claims.

HOUSE

1. PRICE SUPPORTS. Continued debate on H. R. 12, the price support bill (pp. 4699-725, A2986-7). By a teller vote of 186-150, agreed to an amendment by Rep. Green, Pa., to eliminate peanuts from the list of basic commodities and to repeal legislation for peanut allotments (pp. 4699-713).
2. RECLAMATION; LOANS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 5881, to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects (H. Rept. 481)(p. 4727).
3. SALT-WATER RESEARCH. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 2126, to expand the Interior Department's salt-water research program (p. 4699).
4. TOBACCO. A subcommittee approved for reporting to the Agriculture Committee S. J. Res. 60, directing USDA to study and report on burley tobacco controls (p. D374).
5. COPPER IMPORTS. The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 5695, to continue through June 1958 the suspension of certain import taxes on copper (H. Rept. 485)(p. 4727).

6. REORGANIZATION. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 1763, to extend the time for liquidation of the Hoover Commission (H. Rept. 482)(p. 4727).
7. PURCHASING. The Government Operations Committee submitted a report, "Federal Catalog Program Report — Identification and Conversion" (H.Rept.483)(p.4727).
8. PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES. Received from GSA a proposed bill "to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes"; to Government Operations Committee (p. 4727).
9. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Majority Leader McCormack announced the legislative program as follows: Today (Thurs.), price-support and reserve-manpower bills; Fri. and Sat., not in session; Mon., conference report on postal pay bill, and statehood bill (p. 4725).

SENATE

10. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Passed, 75-13, with amendments H. R. 1, to extend to June 30, 1958 the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements (pp. 4732-4851). Sens. Byrd, George, Gore, Millikin, and Martin were appointed Senate conferees on this bill (pp. 4850-1).

During debate on this bill Sen. Langer stated that the Trade Agreements Act "has proved disastrous to the farmers of the Nation"; that his reasons for voting against extension of this Act are set forth in the hearings held before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Senate Judiciary Committee, on importations of rye and barley; and inserted the transcript of these hearings (pp. 4826-50).

Sen. Malone discussed and inserted a GATT nations' "Decision to Grant a Waiver to the U. S. in Connection with Import Restrictions Imposed Under Section 22 of the U. S. Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as Amended" (pp. 4747-8).
11. INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1956. This bill, H. R. 5085, was made the pending business (pp. 4851, 4853).
12. COMMODITY EXCHANGES; CCC CLAIMS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 1398, to authorize subpoenas under the Commodity Exchange Act (S. Rept. 268); and with amendment H. R. 1831, to amend the CCC Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the CCC (S. Rept. 270) (p. 4730).
13. ANIMAL DISEASE. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 1133, to provide for certain indemnity payments in Iowa on account of vesicular exanthema which could not be made because of a technicality (p. 4730).
14. COMMITTEES. The chairman, Agriculture and Forestry Committee, was authorized to appoint subcommittees to consider the following bills: S. 1286, Farm Credit Act of 1955; S. 1636, use of humane methods in slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate or foreign commerce; and S. J. Res. 20, to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture (p. D372).
15. ROADS; TREATIES. Received resolutions urging enactment of legislation for the rapid completion of the Interstate System of Highways, and favoring the enactment of the Bricker amendment to limit the President's treaty-making power (p. 4729).

SUPPLEMENTING THE FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS BY PROVIDING FOR FEDERAL COOPERATION IN NON-FEDERAL PROJECTS AND FOR PARTICIPATION BY NON-FEDERAL AGENCIES IN FEDERAL PROJECTS

MAY 4, 1955.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. ENGLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 5881]

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

This bill by Representative Engle would permit States and local public agencies to take a more active part in developing land and water resources for irrigation and incidental purposes through Federal loans and grants, and would encourage the development of small projects. Similar bills by Representatives A. L. Miller and Clifton Young were also considered by the committee in acting on this legislation. The legislation would be applicable to all 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

States and local public agencies could plan, construct, and operate small projects primarily for irrigation and receive under this legislation substantially the same benefits which would be received if the projects were being constructed as Federal reclamation projects. The Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to make loans covering that portion of the cost of projects which would be reimbursable if they were being constructed as Federal projects and grants covering that portion of the cost of projects which would be non-reimbursable if they were being constructed as Federal projects.

Federal financial participation in any project in the form of a loan, a grant, or a combination of both could not exceed \$5 million.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Legislation similar to H. R. 5881 was introduced in the 83d Congress and extensive hearings were held thereon. The legislation was favored by the Department of the Interior and the administration and had wide support in the Congress. It was supported by interested individuals and organizations throughout the country and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee received no testimony in opposition to it. The bill reported by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the 83d Congress and passed by the House was H. R. 5301 by Representative Miller. This bill failed to pass the Senate in the closing days of the 83d Congress.

The bills introduced in the 84th Congress, though not identical, are similar in their purpose and are similar to H. R. 5301, as passed by the House in the 83d Congress. Hearings on these bills and consideration by the committee resulted in H. R. 104, by Representative Engle, being approved with several amendments. The author introduced a clean bill which incorporated all committee amendments, and the committee, in ordering the legislation reported, substituted this new bill for H. R. 104, as amended.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

There has long existed a need for legislation establishing a simplified planning, review, and authorization procedure for small reclamation projects. Also, it has long been recognized that more active participation by local interests in the development of their land and water resources would be desirable. This legislation would meet the need for small projects legislation and would also encourage more active participation by local water users' organizations.

The President, in his fiscal year 1956 budget message, stated:

To the greatest extent possible, the responsibility for resource development and its cost should be borne by those who receive the benefits. In many instances private interests or State and local governments can best carry on the needed programs.

It is the conclusion of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that the construction and operation of small irrigation and reclamation projects is a phase of the reclamation program which, in many instances, can be assumed by local agencies to the benefit of both those agencies and the Federal Government.

The program which this legislation would authorize fills a gap between the normal Federal reclamation project and the small local developments under the Water Facilities Act administered by the Department of Agriculture. The small projects which would be developed under this legislation, for the most part, do not have the weight to pull their way through the long procedure required for specific authorization by the Congress, nor do they have the ability to go ahead on their own. Consequently, in most instances, there just is no development. The simplified review and authorization procedure set out in this legislation should result in reduction in overhead and administrative costs. These small projects are, for the most part, simple in design and construction and it appears that local

organizations, by making use of local specialized knowledge, could design and construct them more economically than could the Federal Government.

The administration favors this legislation, as indicated by the report of the Department of the Interior included herein. This legislation has the enthusiastic support of irrigation districts and other water users' organizations throughout the country and of many State and National organizations interested in water resource development. Testimony was given to the committee to the effect that there are in the planning stage a great number of small projects throughout the Nation which could be developed under this legislation.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 1 of the bill states its purpose and scope. In extending this legislation to cover all 48 States, it is the committee's understanding that it will not be necessary for the Department of the Interior to establish additional offices throughout the 31 nonreclamation States to administer this program. The committee understands and recommends that the only expansion in organization, if any is required, would be a small increase in personnel in the Washington office for review of the proposals submitted.

Section 2 of the bill defines several terms used therein. The term "organization" has been broadly defined as any organization which has capacity to contract with the United States under the Federal reclamation laws. This would, of course, include States or any department or agency of a State, conservancy districts, irrigation districts, water users' associations, and Carey Act companies.

With respect to the term "project," it is the committee's intention that the projects be for the principal purpose of irrigation with other purposes, such as flood control, municipal water, and power included on an incidental basis. With respect to the size of the projects, the committee considered that \$5 million was an appropriate maximum cost for a project if it was to be considered a "small project." The committee agreed, however, to permit projects costing between \$5 million and \$10 million to apply for the benefits under the legislation, providing that the Federal financial participation in the cost of such projects should not be increased by reason of the higher cost. In other words, the applicant organizations would have to finance all costs in excess of the amount of a loan and/or grant which would be made if the project construction cost were \$5 million. In establishing, under this provision applying to projects costing between \$5 million and \$10 million, the amounts of any loan or grant, it is the committee's intention that the costs allocated to all project purposes shall be scaled down in the same proportion. In addition to agreeing to extend the benefits to projects between \$5 million and \$10 million without increasing the Federal financial participation, the committee agreed that projects primarily for irrigation costing not more than \$10 million might qualify under the legislation for a grant not in excess of \$5 million if there was no application for a loan covering the reimbursable portion of the project. Federal financial participation in any project in the form of a loan, a grant, or a combination of both could not exceed \$5 million.

Section 3 specifies that any organization desiring to obtain benefits provided in the legislation shall submit its proposal to the Secretary

of the Interior in the form and manner prescribed in the subsequent sections of the bill.

Section 4 (a) requires that any proposal by an organization include plans and estimates in detail comparable to those included in preauthorization reports required for a Federal reclamation project. In the committee's view, the detail included should be the minimum necessary to demonstrate the engineering and economic feasibility. An allocation of the capital costs to the various purposes meeting the principles adopted for Federal developments must also be included in the proposal. It is also provided in this section that each proposal must have been submitted for review to all affected States except that if the proposal involves only rehabilitation and betterment of an existing irrigation project, the review may be limited to the State in which the project is located. In requiring this review in a manner provided in the 1944 Flood Control Act, it is the committee's intention that the Secretary of the Interior have the views and comments of all the affected States as a basis for his decision with respect to approval of a project, and not the committee's intention that any one of the affected States be given veto power over a project not in that State. In this connection, section 4 (c) clearly provides that the findings of the Secretary and the Governor of the State in which the project is located are the factors upon which the approval or disapproval of a proposal is to be based.

Section 4 (b) requires that the organization show in its proposal that it already holds or can acquire the lands and the rights to the use of water necessary for construction and operation of the project. This section also requires that the organization finance, otherwise than by loan and grant, the cost of these lands and water rights and such other costs as the Secretary determines to be proper.

Section 4 (c) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with negotiations for loans and/or grants, without further congressional action, for those projects which he and the Governor of the State in which the project is located find to be feasible. The Secretary would, however, be required to submit the project proposals which he approves to the Committees of the Senate and House on Interior and Insular Affairs and not execute contracts covering these proposals until 60 days after such submission.

Section 4 (d) provides that all project works and facilities, except those portions operated to accomplish nonreimbursable purposes, shall remain under the jurisdiction and control of the local contracting organization, subject to the terms of the repayment contract.

Section 5 provides that any contract between the Secretary and an applicant organization set out (1) the maximum amount of any loan involved in the proposal, which loan could not exceed that part of the cost that would be allocated to reimbursable functions if the project were being constructed as a Federal project; (2) the maximum amount of any grant involved in the proposal, which grant could not exceed that portion of the project cost which would be allocated to nonreimbursable functions if the project were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project; (3) a plan of repayment providing that the organization repay the sums loaned to it in not more than 50 years with interest only on the pro rata share of the loan attributable to furnishing irrigation benefits to excess lands and on any portion of the project cost allocated to domestic, industrial, or mu-

nicipal water supply or to commercial power; (4) a provision, if a grant is involved, requiring that the project be operated in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Federal department or agency primarily concerned with the function for which the grant was made; and (5) such other provisions as the Secretary deems necessary or proper to assure prompt repayment of the loan. It is expected that the contract require that the reimbursable interest-bearing investment, by function, be fully repaid by the beneficiaries of each function.

Section 6 provides that proposals covering projects already authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall be made in like manner as set out in preceding sections for non-Federal projects, except that the Secretary may waive any requirements that are unnecessary as a result of action already taken by the United States.

Section 7 provides that any engineering, economic, or hydrologic data which the Federal Government may have relating to any project proposal by an organization may be furnished the organization upon request and the cost connected with the furnishing of such data will, where appropriate, be included in the loan or otherwise paid for by the organization.

Section 8 provides that the planning and construction of projects undertaken pursuant to this legislation shall be subject to all procedural requirements and other provisions of the act of August 14, 1946, which relates to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife.

Section 9 gives the Secretary authority to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper to carry out the provisions of this legislation.

Section 10 authorizes \$100 million to be appropriated to carry out provisions of the act. In limiting the amount authorized to be appropriated to undertake this program, the committee believes that progress under the program should be reviewed before expenditures are made beyond this amount.

Section 11 provides that the legislation be a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws.

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT

The report of the Department of the Interior on this legislation follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington 25, D. C., March 8, 1955.

HON. CLAIR ENGLE,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ENGLE: You have asked for a report from this Department on H. R. 104 and H. R. 384, both of which are bills to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

The general position of this Department with respect to these two bills is the same as that which it took with respect to H. R. 5301, 83d Congress, in its report of April 16, 1954, to your committee. In that letter we said that we were in accord with what we understood to be the principal purpose of H. R. 5301, viz, that of encouraging participation by State and local agencies in the development of reclamation projects through Federal loans and grants to such agencies. We also said that the field of action which would be opened to this Department by the enactment of legislation carrying out such a purpose would be a wide one and

would be a desirable complement to that which is now open to it under the Federal reclamation laws. In addition, your committee will be interested to note that the President's budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, forecasts (p. 830) the later transmission, upon enactment of suitable basic legislation, of a request for an appropriation of \$10 million for this Department "to provide for Federal cooperation with States, local governments, or private persons in their water-resource developments."

The two bills which are now before your committee vary somewhat from each other and from the draft of measure which we recommended for consideration last year. The principal differences are these:

(1) Both bills are limited to the 17 Western States; our recommendation was for a program that, subject to congressional consideration as individual proposals came along, would be nationwide.

(2) H. R. 104 proposes that its benefits shall extend to "any reclamation or irrigation undertaking or * * * self-contained unit of such an undertaking or * * * rehabilitation and betterment program for an existing irrigation project" the cost of which does not exceed \$5 million. The benefits of H. R. 384, on the other hand, would extend to "any undertaking or feature or unit of undertaking, having an estimated cost of not to exceed \$5 million, * * * the sole or principal purpose of which is to store, divert, carry, or deliver water for irrigation or for domestic, industrial, or municipal use or to furnish pumping energy therefor or to drain lands under or susceptible of irrigation." Our proposal of last year included no dollar limitation but otherwise followed the language of H. R. 384 just quoted.

(3) H. R. 384 lacks provisions, such as those which are found in section 6 of H. R. 104 and of our draft substitute for H. R. 5301, to implement its declared purpose of encouraging State and local participation in the development of projects under the Federal reclamation laws as well as the development of similar non-Federal projects. In other words, the details of H. R. 384 treat only with the latter class of undertakings.

(4) H. R. 104 and H. R. 384 both require submission of proposals for review only by the State or States in which the project is to be located. Our draft of substitute bill contemplated submission for review by all of the States of the river basin in which the project would be located in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

(5) Both H. R. 104 and H. R. 384 propose a limitation of 25 percent of the reimbursable costs of the project as the amount which may be required to be contributed by an applicant organization. This limitation will, in some cases, override the bills' other requirement that the organization bear "all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and rights to the use of water" required for the success of the project. The bills also provide that, in the case of a rehabilitation and betterment undertaking, the contracting organization may pledge its existing facilities as a substitute for the whole or a part of the contribution otherwise required of it. Our recommendation with respect to H. R. 5301 placed no limit on the proportion of the cost which the applicant organization might be required to bear, specifically provided that all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and rights to the use of water be borne by the organization in the case of non-Federal projects, made no provision for substitution of a pledge for a cash contribution in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects, and provided in general that preference should be given to applicants in the order of the proportion of contributions proposed to be made by them.

(6) H. R. 104 and H. R. 384 both provide for execution of contracts by the Secretary of the Interior after a stated period during which a proposal is required to lie before the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House and Senate. (H. R. 104 and H. R. 384 vary in some respects on the handling of proposals when the Congress is not in session.) Our proposal envisioned affirmative approval by the Congress of every proposal before a contract was negotiated and executed.

(7) H. R. 104 requires that every contract executed under it shall, except as otherwise provided in the bill, "conform to the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws with respect to repayment contracts entered into by irrigation districts and the delivery of water thereunder * * *." This provision, which is omitted in H. R. 384, would make the so-called excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws applicable to irrigation projects otherwise subject to the terms of the bill.

(8) Both H. R. 104 and H. R. 384 contemplate the making of loans to finance incidental power developments. (Neither of the bills is altogether clear whether the provision for payment of interest is applicable both to pumping power and to

commercial power or only to the latter.) Our proposal involved power only insofar as it is used for pumping purposes.

Many of the points of difference between H. R. 104 and H. R. 384, on the one hand, and our draft of substitute for H. R. 5301, on the other hand, were carefully considered by your committee last year and require no comment at this time. With respect to others, however, and particularly with respect to those which bear upon the problem of the extent of Federal contributions, I invite your attention to the letter dated April 9, 1954, from the Bureau of the Budget which was attached to our report on H. R. 5301. The general tenor of the Bureau of the Budget's letter was to urge increased non-Federal participation in the development and financing of small projects. We recommend that your committee reexamine particularly the matters outlined under (5) and (8) above and that the bills be amended to exclude from their coverage loans for the development of commercial power facilities, to remove the limitation on the proportion of local contributions that the Secretary may require, to provide that the local organizations shall, in all cases, be required to finance the cost of land and water-right acquisitions except in those instances in which Government lands within the administrative jurisdiction of this Department are involved or in which the lands or water rights have already been acquired by the Government for an authorized reclamation project, and to provide that the organizations shall repay any costs incurred by the Government which, if the Government were constructing the projects itself, would be repayable by them.

We also recommend that your committee compare the coverage afforded by the two bills which are now before it in the light of the two definitions of the term "project" which appear therein. It is our view that the expression "self-contained unit" in H. R. 104's definition of "project" may well lead both to a considerable restriction on the usefulness of the bill in which it appears and, in many cases, to misunderstanding. Webster defines "self-contained" as "sufficient in itself," "independent," "having none of its parts in common with anything encompassing it," "complete in itself," etc. Quite apart from financial self-containedness, therefore, the language of the bill leaves room for doubt as to its applicability to even a recognized Missouri River Basin project unit (the kind of unit which, we understand, this is intended to cover) which is dependent for its water supply or for pumping power on Government facilities which are not part of the unit. For this reason, it is our recommendation that your committee consider the advisability of modifying the definition of "project" in H. R. 104. If, as we understand, it is the wish of the committee to restrict the coverage of the bill to small undertakings and to eliminate loans and grants for individual project features, we suggest that the definition be amended to read along these lines:

"The term 'project' shall mean (i) any complete undertaking or distinct unit of such an undertaking authorized to be constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, the sole or principal purpose of which is to store, divert, carry, or deliver water for irrigation or for domestic, industrial, or municipal use, to furnish pumping energy therefor, or to drain lands under or susceptible of irrigation or (ii) any other similar complete undertaking or distinct unit of such an undertaking proposed to be constructed by an organization. The term 'project' shall not include any such undertaking or unit, or any rehabilitation and betterment program, the estimated cost of which is more than \$5,000,000. It shall likewise not extend to individual engineering features of a complete undertaking or distinct unit of an undertaking."

We also recommend that, if your committee concludes that the excess-land provisions of the reclamation laws shall be included in contracts for irrigation works under H. R. 104, provision therefor be made in a form other than that used in the bill. More specifically, we suggest that the bulk of lines 18-21, page 6, be deleted at that point and reinserted on page 8 before (d) as a separate subdivision of the section in which it occurs and that it be made clear that the requirement is applicable only in those cases in which a loan is made for irrigation works.

We recommend that, with appropriate amendments, H. R. 104 or H. R. 384 be enacted.

Because we are informed that there is a particular urgency for the submission of the views of this Department on H. R. 104 and H. R. 384 and at the special request of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, this report is being submitted prior to clearance through the Bureau of the Budget.

In these circumstances, no commitment can be made concerning the relation of the bills or of the views herein expressed to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends that H. R. 5881 be enacted.



Union Calendar No. 125

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5881

[Report No. 481]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 27, 1955

Mr. ENGLE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

MAY 4, 1955

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union
and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the purpose of this Act is to encourage State and local
4 participation in the development of projects under the Federal
5 reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in
6 the development of similar projects in all forty-eight States
7 and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska by non-Federal
8 organizations.

9 SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

1 (a) The term “construction” shall include rehabilita-
2 tion and betterment.

3 (b) The term “Federal reclamation laws” shall mean
4 the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amend-
5 atory thereof or supplementary thereto.

6 (c) The term “organization” shall mean a State or a
7 department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a
8 conservancy district, irrigation district, water users’ associa-
9 tion, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar
10 organization which has capacity to contract with the United
11 States under the Federal reclamation laws.

12 (d) The term “project” shall mean (i) any complete
13 irrigation undertaking or distinct unit of such an undertak-
14 ing or a rehabilitation and betterment program for an exist-
15 ing irrigation project, authorized to be constructed pursuant
16 to the Federal reclamation laws and (ii) any similar under-
17 taking proposed to be constructed by an organization. The
18 term “project” shall not include any such undertaking, unit,
19 or program the cost of which exceeds \$5,000,000: *Provided*,
20 That projects, the estimated cost of which is more than
21 \$5,000,000 but less than \$10,000,000, may qualify under
22 this Act if the applicant organization is ready, able, and will-
23 ing to finance otherwise than by loan or grant under this
24 Act all costs in excess of the amount of the loan or grant
25 which would be made under this Act if the estimated con-

1 construction cost were \$5,000,000: *And provided further*, That
2 nothing contained in this definition shall preclude the mak-
3 ing of a grant not in excess of \$5,000,000 in accordance with
4 the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of this Act, to organiza-
5 tions which qualify for the same and which are not applicants
6 for a loan under this Act.

7 (e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of
8 the Interior.

9 (f) The term "State" or "States" shall include the Ter-
10 ritories of Hawaii and Alaska.

11 SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of
12 the benefits provided in this Act shall submit a proposal
13 therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he
14 shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by
15 a payment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining
16 the proposal.

17 SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construc-
18 tion of a project which has not theretofore been authorized for
19 construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set
20 forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail
21 comparable to those included in preauthorization reports re-
22 quired for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been
23 submitted for review by the State or States in which the proj-
24 ect is located in like manner as provided in subsection (c),
25 section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887),

1 except that the review may be limited to the State or States
2 in which the project is located if the proposal is one for
3 rehabilitation and betterment of an existing project only; and
4 shall include a proposed allocation of capital costs to func-
5 tions such that costs for facilities used for a single purpose
6 shall be allocated to that purpose and costs for facilities used
7 for more than one purpose shall be so allocated among the
8 purposes served that each purpose will share equitably in
9 the costs of such joint facilities.

10 (b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that
11 the organization already holds or can acquire all lands
12 and interests in land (except public and other lands and
13 interests in land owned by the United States which are within
14 the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject
15 to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water neces-
16 sary for the successful construction, operation, and mainte-
17 nance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing
18 to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this Act
19 such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall
20 include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and
21 rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have
22 advised is proper in the circumstances.

23 (c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the
24 Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appro-
25 priate State agency designated by him) to be financially

1 feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the
2 requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the pro-
3 visions of this Act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to
4 negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as pro-
5 vided in section 5; but no such contract shall be executed by
6 the Secretary prior to sixty calendar days (which sixty days,
7 however, shall not include days on which either the House
8 of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of
9 an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain)
10 from the date on which the project proposal has been sub-
11 mitted to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs
12 of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided,*
13 That the said submission may, after the close of any session
14 of the Congress, be made to the chairman and ranking minor-
15 ity member of the said committees and in that event, or in
16 the event that the sixty-day period aforesaid is broken by
17 an adjournment of the Congress, the contract shall not be
18 executed until the expiration of sixty calendar days from
19 the date of such submission or from the date of its original
20 submission to the committees as hereinbefore provided. The
21 Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to
22 Congress or at the time of his determination that the re-
23 quested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the pro-
24 visions of this Act, may reserve from use or disposition

1 inimical to the project any lands and interests in land
2 owned by the United States which are within his adminis-
3 trative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and
4 which are required for use by the project. Any such reser-
5 vation shall expire at the end of two years unless the repay-
6 ment contract provided for in section 5 of this Act shall have
7 been executed.

8 (d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to
9 financial feasibility, emergency, or urgent need for the project,
10 whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irriga-
11 tion water for an existing irrigation project, whether the pro-
12 posal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project
13 works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irri-
14 gation or drainage. All project works and facilities con-
15 structed under this Act, except such portions that are dedi-
16 cated to flood control or other functions which would in the
17 case of a Federal reclamation project be considered non-
18 reimbursable, shall remain under the jurisdiction and control
19 of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of
20 the repayment contract.

21 SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under
22 the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this Act shall
23 set out, among other things—

24 (a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made
25 to the organization and the time and method of making

1 the same available to the organization. Said loan shall
2 not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project
3 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclama-
4 tion project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable
5 functions under general provisions of law applicable to
6 such projects;

7 (b) the maximum amount of any grant to be
8 accorded the organization and the time and method of
9 paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall
10 not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of construct-
11 ing the project which, if it were being constructed as a
12 Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable
13 to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions
14 of law applicable to such projects;

15 (c) a plan of repayment by the organization of
16 (1) the sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from
17 the date when the principal benefits of the project first
18 become available; (2) interest, at the average rate, as de-
19 termined by the Secretary of the Treasury, paid on the
20 long-term interest-bearing marketable securities of the
21 United States outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal
22 year preceding the date on which the contract is executed,
23 on that pro rata share of the loan which is attributable to
24 furnishing irrigation benefits in each particular year to
25 land held in private ownership by any one owner in

1 excess of one hundred and sixty irrigable acres; and
2 (3) in the case of any project involving an allocation
3 to domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or
4 commercial power produced as an element of the project
5 and incidental to its full development, interest on the
6 unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the
7 loan at a rate as determined in (2) above;

8 (d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant
9 predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable
10 functions is made, in accordance with regulations with
11 respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal
12 department or agency primarily concerned with those
13 functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such
14 regulations, for operation by the United States or for
15 repayment to the United States of the amount of any
16 such grant; and

17 (e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem
18 necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security
19 for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as afore-
20 said. The liability of the United States under any con-
21 tract entered into pursuant to this Act shall be contingent
22 upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the
23 same, and every such contract shall so recite.

24 SEC. 6. Any proposal with respect to the construction of
25 a project which has theretofore been authorized for construc-

tion under the Federal reclamation laws shall be made in like manner as a proposal under section 4 of this Act, but the Secretary may waive such requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of that section as he finds to be duplicative of, or rendered unnecessary or impossible by, action already taken by the United States. Upon approval of any such proposal by the Secretary he may negotiate and execute a contract which conforms, as nearly as may be, to the provisions of section 5 of this Act.

SEC. 7. Upon request of an organization which has made or intends to make a proposal under this Act, the head of any Federal department or agency may make available to the organization any existent engineering, economic, or hydrologic information and printed material that it may have and that will be useful in connection with the planning, design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the project concerned. The cost of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the cost of making and administering any loan under this Act shall, to the extent that they would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 5 of this Act unless they are otherwise paid for by the organization.

1 SEC. 8. The planning and construction of projects under-
2 taken pursuant to this Act shall be subject to all procedural
3 requirements and other provisions of the Act of August 14,
4 1946 (60 Stat. 1080).

5 SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to perform any
6 and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as
7 may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions
8 of this Act.

9 SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropri-
10 ated, such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,-
11 000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act. All such
12 appropriations shall remain available until expended and
13 shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under
14 this Act, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove
15 provided.

16 SEC. 11. This Act shall be a supplement to the Federal
17 reclamation laws.

[Report No. 481]

A BILL

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

By Mr. ENGLE

APRIL 27, 1955

Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular
Affairs

MAY 4, 1955

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
H. R. 5881

(H. R. 5881)

A BILL

to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the payment of interest on the principal of the national debt, and for other purposes.

IN SENATE,
January 1, 1955.

REPORT

OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
U. S. SENATE

1955

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20540

5/19/55

on May 24 (pp. 5626-7, 5642-3).

11. PUBLIC LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 1464, to authorize the Interior Department to acquire rights-of-way and existing connecting roads for access roads to public lands under its jurisdiction (S. Rept. 364)(p. 5603).
12. ROADS. Sen. Byrd inserted several newspaper articles commenting on the President's proposed road program (pp. 5619-23).
13. FORESTRY; MINING. Sen. Humphrey spoke in favor of S. 1713, to provide protection of national forests from unreasonable mining claims, and inserted a Sport Fishing Institute Bulletin article, "Mining Claims and Fishing," discussing this subject (pp. 5624-5).
14. PERSONNEL. Received a draft of proposed legislation from the Civil Service Commission to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 5601).
15. SEED STORAGE. Received a resolution of the Greater North Dakota Association favoring the establishment of a national seed storage facility (p. 5603).
16. OLEOMARGARINE. Sen. Thye remarked on actions under consideration by the Federal Trade Commission against certain manufacturers of oleomargarine who have allegedly used false advertising to the detriment of the dairy industry (pp. 5613-4).
17. ELECTRIFICATION; RECLAMATION. Sen. Murray inserted an article from America by Mark J. Fitzgerald, S. J., in support of S. 1333 to construct a high dam on the Snake River (pp. 5618-9).
 Sen. Watkins exchanged remarks with Sen. Kuchel on the value of the Colorado River Storage project, and inserted a statement by W. A. Dexheimer in support of the project (pp. 5639-41).
 Sen. Neuberger commented in support of the Crooked River Project and the proposal to use power revenues to help finance the project. W. A. Dexheimer's statement is included in support thereof. (pp. 5648-9.)
 Sen. Neuberger inserted an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch critical of the Administration's program to permit development of the Hells Canyon project by Idaho Power and urging the construction of a high dam by the Federal government (pp. 5649-50).

HOUSE

18. RESERVE FORCES. Continued debate on H. R. 5297, to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces (pp. 5651-63).
19. ~~SURPLUS COMMODITIES; RECLAMATION.~~ The Rules Committee ordered reported resolutions for consideration of ~~H. R. 2851, to authorize CCC to process food commodities for donation to the needy; and H. R. 5881, to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects (p. D442).~~
 The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 4663, to authorize the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, Calif. (H. Rept. 602) (p. 5699).

20. TRAVEL EXPENSE. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendment H. R. 6295, to provide for an increase in maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses (H. Rept. 604) (p. 5699).
21. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 6239, the D. C. appropriation bill for 1956 (pp. 5666-85).
Passed as reported H. J. Res 310, the second urgent deficiency appropriation bill, 1955 (p. 5686). The joint resolution, which had been reported without amendment earlier in the day (H. Rept. 605), provides 263,475 for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government and \$25 million for the Veterans' Administration for readjustment benefits (p. 5699).
The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6367, the Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill for 1956 (H. Rept. 603) (p. 5699).
22. FARM PROGRAM; RECLAMATION. Rep. Holifield criticized the administration's present flexible price support program, the reduction in acreage allotments, and the proposed upper Colorado River project (pp. 5687-93).
23. PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Meader inserted a Jackson Citizen Patriot editorial objecting to his criticism of Gov. Williams' support of H. R. 12, the 90 percent price support bill (pp. 5663-4).
24. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Rep. Bailey criticized certain provisions of H. R. 1, the trade agreements extension bill, as passed by the Senate (pp. 5693-6).
25. ELECTRIFICATION. Received a Mo. Legislature resolution urging an appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration, and to make power available to all who need it (p. 5699).
26. SCHOOL MILK. Received an Hawaiian Legislature resolution urging extension of the special school milk program to Hawaii (p. 5699).
27. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 23 (p. 5699). Legislative program as announced by Majority Leader McCormack: Mon., D. C. bills; Tues., Commerce appropriation bill; Wed., Thurs., and Fri., H. R. 2851, surplus commodities donation bill, and H. R. 5881, loans to small reclamation projects (p. 5686).
28. REORGANIZATION; PERSONNEL. H. Doc. 164 (see Digest 81) is a Presidential recommendation that Congress approve a GS-18 position, in lieu of a GS-17 position, for the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization.

BILLS INTRODUCED

29. WHEAT. S. 2013, by Sen. Schoeppel, to provide for an emergency wheat program to be effective in 1956 if producers disapprove marketing quotas for the 1956 wheat crop; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 5604). Remarks of author (p. 5605).
30. INFORMATION. S. 2017, by Sen. Langer, to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the misuse by collecting agencies of names, emblems, and insignia to indicate Federal agency; to Judiciary Committee (p. 5604).
31. PERSONNEL. S. 2019, by Sen. Carlson, to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 5604). Remarks of author (p. 5606).

Duty-Free GI Gifts: Passed H. R. 5559, to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the U. S. Armed Forces on duty abroad.

Page 5666

D. C. Appropriations: Passed, by a voice vote, H. R. 6239, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1956. A motion to recommit the bill was rejected by a voice vote.

Adopted an amendment designed to keep public welfare grants at the present level.

Rejected amendments that sought to—

Restore \$4 million to the amount to be contributed by the Federal Government.

Add \$267,499 to the bill for 18 additional teaching positions, 14 additional clerks for schools, and for the repair and maintenance of schools.

The bill authorizes appropriations of \$166,547,509 for the operation of the government of the District of Columbia, including \$34,306,500 for capital outlay. This appropriation is \$4,225,290 under the 1955 appropriation and \$8,857,791 below the budget estimates.

Pages 5666–5685

Urgent Deficiency Appropriation: Adopted H. J. Res. 310, making additional appropriations for fiscal year 1955, by a voice vote.

The resolution authorizes appropriations of \$263,475 for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; and \$25 million for the Veterans' Administration for readjustment benefits.

Page 5686

Banking and Currency: The Committee on Banking and Currency was granted permission to file, by midnight Saturday, reports on the following bills:

H. R. 619, to provide that all U. S. currency shall bear the inscription "In God We Trust."

H. R. 5512, conveyance of certain property under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administration to the State of Louisiana.

S. 755, authorizing conveyance of certain war housing projects to the cities of Warwick and Hampton, Va.; and

H. R. 6227, to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies.

Page 5687

District of Columbia: The Committee on the District of Columbia was granted permission to file, by midnight Friday, sundry reports.

Page 5687

Committee To Sit: The Committee on Foreign Affairs was granted permission to sit during the sessions of the House for the week of May 23.

Page 5666

Program for Monday: Adjourned at 5:54 p. m. until Monday, May 23, at 12 o'clock noon when the House will act on bills pertaining to the District of Columbia; five bills are scheduled for consideration.

Committee Meetings

MARKETING FACILITIES

Committee on Agriculture: Began hearings on H. R. 4054, to provide a system of mortgage insurance to municipal and other political subdivisions of the States, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, for the expansion of public wholesale market facilities for perishable agricultural commodities. Kenneth Scott, Director of Agricultural Credit Services, Department of Agriculture, testified in connection with the proposed legislation. Adjourned until tomorrow morning.

FARM CREDIT

Committee on Agriculture: Held further hearings on H. R. 5168, to provide for retirement of Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration, and to increase borrowing participation in the management and control of the Farm Credit System. Witnesses heard today were J. B. Chambers, Brownsville, Tex.; Glenn R. Harris, Richvale, Calif.; W. D. Partlow, Beaumont Production Credit Association of Texas; B. E. Stallones, Bank of Cooperators Stockholders, Houston, Tex.; and Wilmer Smith, National Advisory Committee of Stockholders of the Cooperative Banks, Wilson, Tex. Adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

ELECTIONS—TAXES—CARFARES

Committee on the District of Columbia: Ordered the following bills reported to the House—

H. R. 191, to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions;

H. R. 2406, to provide that property transferred exclusively for public or municipal purposes, to the United States or the District of Columbia, or exclusively for charitable, educational, or religious purposes, shall be exempt from D. C. inheritance and estate taxes; and

H. R. 3908, to fix D. C. street-transit fares for school-children at half the established fare.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Ordered reported to the House H. R. 6382, to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended.

MULTIPLE MINING, PUBLIC LANDS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: The Rogers (Texas) subcommittee heard testimony today in support of H. R. 5891, and eight other related bills, which would amend the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of public lands. Witnesses testifying were Representative Ellsworth, author of one of the bills (H. R. 5577); Edward Woozley, Director, Bureau of Land Management, De-

partment of the Interior; Elmer Bennett, legislative counsel, Department of the Interior; Richard E. McArdle, Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; George D. Riley, American Federation of Labor; Perry A. Thompson, Western Lumber Manufacturers, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; Raymond B. Holbrook, American Mining Congress; Lowell Besley, executive director, American Forestry Association; W. D. Hagenstein, managing director, Industrial Forestry Association, Portland, Oreg.; Charles H. Callison, conservation director, National Wildlife Federation; and Michael Hudoba, Washington editor of Sports Afield. Recessed until tomorrow morning.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Committee on Public Works: Continued public hearings in connection with its study of Federal-aid legislation. Today's witnesses were Carl Fritts, vice president for engineering, Automotive Safety Foundation; Sidney J. Williams, assistant to the president, National Safety Council; and Howard Zahniser, representing the Wilderness Society, Inc. Recessed on the subject until Monday morning.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Committee on Public Works: Ordered reported to the House H. R. 5923, to authorize certain sums to be appropriated immediately for the completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway.

RECLAMATION—FARM COMMODITIES

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule providing 2 hours of debate on H. R. 5881, to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. Appearing on the proposal were Representatives Aspinall, Jones of Alabama, Hope, Saylor, and Young.

Also granted an open rule providing 1 hour of debate on H. R. 2851, providing surplus farm commodities for relief distribution in certain areas. Representatives Jennings and Hope testified on this legislation.

Considered, but took no action on, a rule for H. R. 3990, authorizing investigation and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska. Testifying on behalf of this subject were Representative Aspinall and Delegate Bartlett. Speaking in opposition were Representatives Budge and Saylor.

BRIDGE COMMISSION—AGRICULTURE

Committee on Rules: Ordered reported to the House H. Res. 244, creating a select committee to investigate financial position of the White County Bridge Commission. Representative Denton, of Indiana, spoke on the resolution, of which he is the author.

Also considered, but took no action on, H. Res. 139, authorizing subpoena and investigative powers for studies

by the Committee on Agriculture. Heard on this proposal were Representatives Cooley, Hope, and McIntire.

ALUMINUM STUDY

Select Committee on Small Business: Held further hearings in connection with its study of current shortages and long-range problems in the aluminum industry. Today's witnesses were Phillip Lemmelman of the Aluminum Extruders Council; Robert Katz, Badger Aluminum Co. of New York; and Nathaniel Davis, Aluminium Ltd., Sales, Inc., New York City. Recessed on the subject until Monday morning.

Joint Committee Meetings

BRIEFING BY CIA

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: Committee met in executive session to receive a briefing from Director Allen Dulles and other representatives of the Central Intelligence Agency, but made no announcements and recessed subject to call.

SUBCOMMITTEE PROGRAM

Joint Committee on the Economic Report: Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy held an executive meeting to consider its program, but made no announcements and recessed subject to call.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Conferees continued, in executive session, to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H. R. 1, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements, after which the following announcement was made:

The Senate amendments on which no final action has been taken by the conferees: 1, 2, 3, 10, 14, 15, 16, 27, 28, and 29.

The Senate amendments on which the House conferees receded and concurred: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26.

The Senate conferees receded from its amendments numbered 13 and 18.

The Senate amendments of substance to which the House conferees agreed are as follows:

(1) Amendments 4, 6, 9, and 23. These amendments change from July 1, 1955, to January 1, 1955, the date on which the existing rates of duty could be reduced by 15 percent.

(2) Amendment 7. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment deleting the provision which permitted a reduction of duties by 50 percent of their January 1, 1945, level in the case of articles normally not imported or normally imported in negligible quantities.

(3) Amendment 26. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment which required the Tariff Commission to submit an annual factual report to the Congress on the operation of the trade agreements program.

The Senate amendment of substance on which the Senate receded is as follows:

(1) Amendment 13. The Senate conferees agreed to restore the provision of the House bill which had been deleted by the Senate authorizing the President to round out rates of duty to an extent not exceeding one-half of 1 percent ad valorem in making changes in tariff rates.

Conferees meet again Wednesday, May 25.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued May 24, 1955

For actions of May 23, 1955

84th-1st, No. 85

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....30	Flood control.....15	Prices, support.....25
Agriculture	Forestry.....13	spreads.....27
appropriations.....28	Hearing examiners.....18	Reclamation.....2,22
Air pollution.....16	Hoover Commission.11,29,32	Relief, domestic.....3
Appropriations	Labor, farm.....6	Research.....14,24
.....1,5,10,11,32	Lands.....9,13	Roads.....5,10,17
Banking and currency.....8	Legislative program.....17	Soil conservation.....30
Boundary fence.....12	Loans.....11,32	Surplus commodities.....3
CCC, feed.....21	Marketing quotas.....19	Surplus property.....4
claims.....31	Mutual security.....17	Veterans' affairs.....7,32
Dairy industry.....23	Organization.....7,29	Water.....14
Electrification.....9,22	Personnel.....20	Wheat.....19,24
Family-size farms.....26	Postal pay.....17	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported Mexican fence bill and salt-water research bill. Senate debated road bill. House agreed to conference report on Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill and to Senate amendments to bill to provide additional surplus property for education and health agencies. Both bills ready for President. House Rules Committee cleared bills for loans to small reclamation projects and for donations of surplus commodities. House committee ordered reported Mexican farm labor bill. President approved agricultural appropriation bill and bill to repeal ACP tie-in with acreage allotments.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 4876, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1956 (pp. 5812-3). This bill will now be sent to the President.
2. RECLAMATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 5881, to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects (pp. 5814, 5837).
Reps. Holifield and Dawson (Utah) discussed the proposed upper Colorado River project and some of the effects it would have on agriculture (pp. 5825-8).
3. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 2851, to authorize CCC to process food commodities for donation to the needy through HEW (pp. 5821, 5837).
4. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Concurred in Senate amendments to H. R. 3322, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes (pp. 5813-4). This bill will now be sent to the President.

5. ROADS. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H. R. 5923, to authorize appropriations for completion of the Inter-American Highway (H.Rept. 611) (p. 5837).
6. FARM LABOR. The Agriculture Committee voted to report H. R. 3822, extending for $3\frac{1}{2}$ years (until June 30, 1959), the program of recruitment of agricultural workers from Mexico (p. 1453).
7. ORGANIZATION. Rep. Patman discussed and criticized certain recommendations of the Hoover Commission, especially those relating to veterans and their dependents (pp. 5821-3).
8. BANKING AND CURRENCY. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6227, to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies (H. Rept. 609) (p. 5837).
9. ELECTRIFICATION; LANDS. Both Houses received Hawaiian Legislature resolutions requesting REA to investigate the possibility of setting up a rural-electrification cooperative to serve certain areas in Hawaii, and urging the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to the use of such lands (pp. 5837, 5742).

SENATE

10. ROADS. Continued debate on S. 1048, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways. Agreed to the committee amendments en bloc. Sen. Martin submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute which was still pending at recess. (pp. 5754-92, 5795-5809.)
11. SECOND URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1955. The appropriations Committee/
~~amendment~~ ^{reported without} this measure, H. J. Res. 310, which provides funds for VA readjustment loans and the Hoover Commission (S. Rept. 371) (pp. 5744, 5792).
12. BOUNDARY FENCE. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. 76, authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Mexican western land boundary fence project (S. Rept. 373), and Sen. Goldwater's name was added as co-sponsor of the bill (p. 5745).
13. FOREST LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 55, to authorize the United States to buy lands in the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forests from the Aztec Land and Cattle Co., Ltd. (S. Rept. 369) (p. 5744).
14. SALT-WATER RESEARCH. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 516, extending the program of research in the development and utilization of saline waters (S. Rept. 370) (p. 5744).
15. FLOOD CONTROL. Sen. Fulbright inserted a resolution adopted by the Arkansas General Assembly petitioning Congress to provide funds for the construction of the Greer's Ferry project on the White River in Arkansas (p. 5743).
16. AIR POLLUTION. The Public Works Committee ordered reported with amendments S. 928, to amend the Water Pollution Control Act to provide for the control of air pollution (p. 1452).
17. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM as announced by Sen. Johnson: Today the Senate will vote on the postal-pay bill and then will resume debate on the road bill. It is

CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 5881

MAY 23, 1955.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. Res. 248]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 248, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.



House Calendar No. 63

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 248

[Report No. 612]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 23, 1955

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it
2 shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into
3 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union
4 for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement
5 the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal co-
6 operation in non-Federal projects and for participation by
7 non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. After general
8 debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue
9 not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled
10 by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Com-
11 mittee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read
12 for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclu-

1 sion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Com-
2 mittee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such
3 amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous
4 question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and
5 amendments thereto to final passage without intervening
6 motion except one motion to recommit.

House Calendar No. 63

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 248

[Report No. 612]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H. R. 5881,
a bill to supplement the Federal reclamation
laws by providing for Federal cooperation
in non-Federal projects and for participa-
tion by non-Federal agencies in Federal
projects.

By Mr. BOLLING

MAY 23, 1955

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be
printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued May 26, 1955
For actions of May 25, 1955
84th-1st, No. 86

CONTENTS

Apple prices.....19	Lands.....3,4	Postal pay.....10
Appropriations.....8	Legislative program.....9	Price supports.....16
Dairy industry.....6	Loans.....8	Reclamation.....2,9,13
Disaster relief.....11,15	farm.....9,11,15	Regulatory procedure.....5
Electrification.....13,14	Low-income farmers.....4	Roads.....7
Extension work.....4	Mexican boundary fence...9	Saline-water research..18
Forestry.....9	Minerals.....3	Surplus commodities..1,17
Hoover Commission.....8	Personnel.....12	

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bill for donations of surplus commodities. Senate passed road bill. House agreed to consider small reclamation projects bill.

HOUSE

1. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Passed, 343 to 1, as reported H. R. 2851, to authorize CCC to process food commodities for donation to the needy (pp. 5928-30, 5932-44). The bill provides the following: Requires CCC to make available to HEW, for providing emergency assistance to the needy, agricultural commodities and products (including cereals and cereal products) acquired through price support operations. Authorizes CCC to pay processing and other charges up to the time of delivery to central locations in States. Upon certifications of the Labor Department and the Governors as to need, directs HEW to make such commodities and products available to State agencies. Provides that CCC make Sec. 416 commodities available without compensation and that HEW reimburse CCC for other commodities at the acquisition cost or current support price (whichever is lower) plus the costs of processing, etc. Provides that CCC expenditures under this bill may be made in advance of appropriations and shall be entered as accounts receivable.
2. RECLAMATION. Agreed to the resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 5881, to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects (pp. 5930-1).
3. LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. 265, and with amendment H. R. 1844, to amend acts authorizing agricultural entries under the nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such act (H. Repts. 626 and 628); also reported without amendment H. R. 4894, to repeal laws authorizing sale of public lands which are valuable chiefly for timber and stone (H. Rept. 627) (pp. 5949-50).

4. LANDS; EXTENSION WORK; LCW-INCOME FARMERS. Both Houses received from this Department proposed bills to transfer land and buildings now used for research under cooperative agreement with the Virgin Islands Corporation (to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee and House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee); to authorize additional appropriations for cooperative extension work among low-income farmers; and to provide more adequate credit for low-income farmers (to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee and House Agriculture Committee); (pp. 5949-5952).
5. REGULATORY PROCEDURE. Received from the Director, Administrative Office of the U. S. Courts proposed legislation "to provide for reasonable notice to the agency of applications to the courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against orders of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Maritime Board and the Atomic Energy Commission;" to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 5878, Cong. Rec. for May 24, 1955).
6. DAIRY INDUSTRY. The following is quoted from a House Agriculture Committee release dated May 24: "Representative Thomas G. Abernethy, chairman of the Dairy subcommittee ..., announced today that following hearings scheduled for June 1, 2, and 3, the subcommittee will recess its hearings on the general dairy industry for about 5 weeks because a pressing agenda of full committee hearings on pending bills will leave virtually no opportunity for subcommittee hearings during that period We hope to be able to resume these hearings early in July and continue without substantial interruption until they are completed."

SENATE

7. ROADS. Passed with amendments S. 1048 which authorizes a Federal-aid road construction program (pp. 5956-6022).
8. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed H. J. Res. 310, second urgent deficiency appropriation measure, 1955, with clarifying amendment in which the House concurred (pp. 5961-2, 6008). This measure provides funds for VA readjustment loans and the Hoover Commission. It will now be sent to the President.
9. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnston, Tex., alerted the Senate for consideration this week of S. 1755, which would establish a maximum interest rate of 3% on certain farm loans; H. R. 103, to provide for a distribution system on Federal reclamation projects; S. 180, providing for construction and maintenance of the Washita River Basin reclamation project; S. 55, which would authorize transfer of certain lands to the U. S. within the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forests; S. 516, to extend saline water research; and S. 76, to authorize the construction and maintenance of a Mexican boundary fence (p. 6023).
10. POSTAL PAY BILL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported with amendments S. 2061 for an average 8% pay increase (D465).

BILLS INTRODUCED

11. DISASTER LOANS. H. R. 6470, by Rep. Berry, to amend Public Law 727, 83d Congress, so as to extend the period for the making of emergency loans for agricultural purposes; to Agriculture Committee (p. 5950).

Committee on Agriculture now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

At this point I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution (H. Res. 249) makes in order consideration of the bill H. R. 2851 from the Committee on Agriculture.

Briefly stated, the substance of the bill to be made in order by the adoption of this resolution amends present law with reference to relief programs. Under the present law, when the President of the United States designates certain areas as disaster areas by reason of drought or unusual unemployment, certain commodities, particularly those of a perishable nature, are set aside for the respective States, to be used by them through the Department of Agriculture for the people in the distressed areas. This bill amends the present law to this effect:

Under the present law the Department of Agriculture can reprocess products but it cannot process products. This bill amends the present law to the effect that the Department of Agriculture may now process, and that has particular reference to grains, storable products, which may be in surplus throughout the country. That is, they can make wheat into flour; corn into meal.

Then the other amendment is that it transfers a part of this program to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in that it gives them certain authority in those designated areas. In other words, it empowers the head of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make agreements with the departments in the respective States as to the amount needed, and the method of distribution.

As far as I have been able to learn, there is no opposition to this bill. There was some division of sentiment, as I understand it, in the committee where it was discussed, but those divisions have been resolved by amendments in this bill, and I hope the resolution is approved and that the bill made possible by this resolution is agreed to.

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

LOWER SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, like so many others, I have been increasingly concerned about, and disturbed over the growing plight of our public and private school systems, and particularly, the

costs of the construction of schools. Confining my remarks mainly to the public school system, what I say shall also apply to the private school system.

The figures released by the United States Department of Education in February of this year concerned with the inadequate accommodations for pupils entering the public school system are amazing in their adverse effect on our institutions of Government. Included in these figures was a table showing that there were more than 2,600,000 pupils in the public school system alone in excess of the normal capacity of the accessible public owned school plants in use. This is only a slight indication of what is facing our public school system in overcrowding, split shifts, and the use of substandard, makeshift quarters; and with our growing population, this will increase. I might also say that the cost of school construction is vitally important.

The 81st Congress passed Public Law 815 and title I of the act provided that the United States Department of Education should supervise a nationwide survey of the public elementary and secondary school plant facilities. The findings of this survey disclosed the extent of this crisis in the school construction field. Typical was the revelation that almost one-half of the school buildings of our great Nation are more than 30 years old, and about one-fourth are over 50 years old—and many of these older buildings lacked adequate lighting, plumbing, heating, and ventilating facilities. It is hard to realize that in the 43 States covered by the survey, 54.99 percent of all elementary school buildings of those States still use outdoor privies. According to accepted educational standards, more than 56 percent of the classrooms of our country are already overcrowded, with the peak of increased enrollment still some 5 years ahead.

The lag in schoolhouse construction understandingly resulted from the depression and the war period of material and manpower shortages. It has been increased by the very high postwar birthrate which has placed our nationwide school plant into a position where it needs today at least 312,000 additional instruction rooms to accommodate almost 9 million pupils, which will cost at current prices about \$10.6 billion. The financial problem in countless communities has also played a significant part. To house the pupils who are expected to be added to the school population by 1965, there will be required an additional 420,000 classrooms costing an additional \$14.3 billion. And to replace the classrooms in the present nationwide school plant which are inadequate, obsolete, worn out, and unsafe will require an additional 220,000 rooms by 1965 costing an additional \$7.5 billion.

Historically the construction of public school buildings in the United States has been a function of the local communities or school districts. They have very successfully financed this public service by issuing general obligation bonds or other evidences of indebtedness supported by the full faith and credit of the local taxing district. Most of these

groups have operated under debt limitation provisions imposed by legislative act or constitutional provisions. It has been reliably estimated that the total legal borrowing capacity of all of the cities, towns, and school districts of our Nation is about \$35 billion. Of this amount more than \$31 billion has previously been encumbered by borrowings for schools and other eligible public improvements. It is obvious that the school construction needs greatly exceed the available funds which may legally be raised.

I think you will agree with me that there is perhaps no greater responsibility on we Americans than that of insuring the availability of education in school buildings conveniently located, safely constructed, and presenting an environment of welcome, warmth, and friendliness that will stimulate the learning process and make schoolwork a pleasurable experience to be treasured for life.

During the 83d Congress some 31 bills and joint resolutions were introduced proposing some form of Federal assistance to schoolhouse construction and education. Each of these bills recognized the importance of education and the plight of the public school system, and each contained some element or plan to alleviate some of this distress. The current Congress has before it many similar proposals, including a plan urgently recommended by the President, who from time to time has stated unequivocally that our school system demands some prompt and effective help if we are to provide adequate education.

Over the years this question of Federal aid to school construction has arisen before this Congress and in public discussion. The argument presented both pro and con have had wide ramifications. The supporters of each side have been able, well fortified, and vocal, and the debates have been sound and heated but also interminable. While this endless debate has been following its leisure course, the inexorable maturity of the children has brought them to the doors of substandard school buildings—to the doors of overcrowded buildings—and to the doors of nonexistent school buildings both public and private. These more than 2,600,000 pupils that I previously mentioned are being deprived in part of the complete education which is their American privilege and heritage.

The need for new and adequate schoolhousing in our States is critical, and during this trying period of current turbulence, nothing is as important to a free society as the preservation of our public institutions—of our school systems—since nothing has a deeper or more far-reaching effect upon the conduct of man as a citizen than adequate educational opportunity.

It is with great pleasure that I advise you and those throughout the country who are interested in a discovery which I recently came across, a discovery which indicates the availability of a simple, straightforward, and practical solution to some of the schoolhouse construction problems over which we have labored so long, and belabored so effectively. We, in the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, are facing a schoolhouse short-

age problem analogous to that of our sister States, though we have been fortunate in having available a greater degree of financial ability to meet these needs than some of our less fortunate companions. In spite, however, of our tremendous resources it was apparent to many of our citizens that to continue a school-building program at a rate of expenditure per pupil which was characteristic of the early 1950's, we would soon exhaust our resources short of having constructed sufficient classrooms for our rapidly growing child population. This is particularly so, having in mind the other duties and responsibilities of government.

A group of trained and qualified citizens of Massachusetts, realizing the implications of our school needs and the urgency for the construction of an adequate number of classrooms at a cost we could afford, undertook an exhaustive study of the problem locally and nationally. They also undertook the responsibility of developing a program that would permit communities and school districts of our Nation, and this would also cover private schools, to obtain needed school buildings quickly at reasonable costs with or without State or Federal aid, and in a manner not restricted by archaic and unrealistic statutory and constitutional debt limits.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this group proposes and offers to build and equip healthful, attractive, safe, fire-resistive, flexible, low-cost school buildings of modular components which will permit expansion or contraction of the structures as the need may require. One of the real contributions of this program comes from the fact that this group, where and when desired, is willing to finance the construction of these badly needed buildings with private capital in a manner which will not adversely effect the legal borrowing capacity of the community or school district, and at annual costs which may run as much as 50 percent less than the average current costs of conventional school-building projects. Arrangements can also be made with those responsible for the construction of a private school or schools. In order to do this with private funds, of course, these buildings provide a life expectancy and freedom from maintenance greatly in excess of the average buildings being constructed today.

The Anderson-Nichols Co., architectural engineers of Boston, one of New England's largest and most competent architectural engineering firms, in conjunction with educators, public officers, and finance specialists, have undertaken a 4-year research program which has culminated in the development of a schoolhouse plan which permits construction from readily available, modular components with a maximum degree of flexibility of design to meet the requirements of available sites and the individual desires and needs of local school authorities.

From this research group has evolved an organization known as Structo Schools Corp., located in Boston, Mass. This group offers to design, build, and equip school buildings for communities or school districts, whether distressed or

not, utilizing the modular plan developed by the Anderson-Nichols Co. The group offers to finance these buildings with private capital in such a way as to relieve any encumbrance upon the debt or borrowing limits of the community. It is expected that the annual costs of a project under this program will be approximately 50 percent less than the average annual costs of the current conventional school building projects. The source of private funds for this purpose seems virtually unlimited.

The communities or school districts will only be required to appropriate an annual amount as a rental fee, and this amount is expected to produce a substantially lower impact on local tax rates than the present plans.

The program has received the approval and wholehearted support of many national organizations in the fields of education, finance, manufacturing, and construction, as a worthwhile cooperative effort to meet the challenge of schoolhouse shortages. The very startling aspect of this program has been the success of Structo Schools Corp. to raise large segments of private capital to permit school buildings to be built and rented to local school authorities, or, in the case of private schools to the proper authority, at annual rental rates substantially below the average normal average costs of debt service required when general obligation bonds are issued.

It is most pleasing to me to learn that the ingenuity and the interest of private citizens can be stimulated toward the development of a solution to a problem which has long plagued the Congress and other public officers, as well as others, and to learn that they have successfully developed a plan which may work quickly and surely, and whose objective is a contribution to the preservation of one of our most essential, democratic ideals. This group of public spirited citizens are to be complimented for their willingness to face the challenge, and their ingenuity in finding a solution of this critical national problem.

As the leadership and efforts of Mr. Anderson of the firm of Anderson-Nichols Co., after several years of study, evaluation, and of making designs, has resulted in a manner that school building costs can be sharply reduced, a number of such schools have been constructed, I am pleased, as a public duty, to make known as widely as possible this program to those interested; and particularly those who are responsible for the construction and maintenance of schools. The cost of constructing schools, either public or private, is a matter of major concern. If the cost can be sharply reduced, I know it will be a matter of major interest.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] has explained the rule and the main provisions of the bill. I know of no one who is opposed to the rule, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 248 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 248 provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

H. R. 5881 as reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs would permit States and local public agencies to take a more active part in developing land and water resources for irrigation and incidental purposes through Federal loans and grants, and would encourage the development of small projects. The provisions of the bill would apply to the 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

Under the bill, the States and local public agencies would plan, construct, and operate small projects primarily for irrigation and they would receive practically the same benefits which would be theirs if the projects were being constructed as Federal reclamation projects.

The bill would permit the Secretary of the Interior to make loans covering that portion of the cost of the project which would be reimbursable if they were being constructed as Federal projects and the Secretary would make grants covering that portion of the cost of the project which would be nonreimbursable if the project were being constructed under Federal auspices.

Federal financial participation in any project in the form of a loan, a grant, or a combination of both could not exceed \$5 million.

A bill that resembled H. R. 5881 passed the House during the 83d Congress but

failed to pass the Senate. The President in his budget message for 1956 advocated a program of this type and during the hearings on this bill, according to the committee report, it was disclosed that there were a number of small projects that were in the planning stage now, but could and would be completed if there is a program such as is proposed in this bill. The committee felt that \$5 million was an appropriate maximum cost for a project if it was to fall within the category of a small one. However, under the provisions of H. R. 5881, as reported, a project costing between 5 and 10 million dollars could apply for the benefits applicable under the legislation but the Federal participation in the financing of the project could not be increased due to the higher cost of the project.

Any organization desiring to take advantage of the benefits provided under H. R. 5881 would submit its proposal to the Secretary of the Interior with all the plans and estimates that would be included in preauthorization reports required for a Federal reclamation project.

The bill would specifically provide that the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of the State in which the project is proposed would be the approving authorities for the project.

The bill would also require that the Secretary of the Interior submit to both the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs the project proposals at least 60 days before the contracts are executed covering these projects. However, the Secretary of the Interior would be authorized in this bill to proceed with negotiations for loans and/or grants without further congressional action after he and the Governor of the State involved, have placed their stamp of approval upon the individual projects.

The organization applying for the benefits offered under the provisions of this bill would have to show in its proposal that it already holds or can acquire the lands and the rights to the use of water necessary for construction and operation of the project, and the organization must finance the cost of these lands and water rights by other methods than by loans and grants from the Government.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, would authorize the appropriation of \$100 million to undertake this program. It is my understanding that an amendment to the bill will be offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], which will have the effect of giving the Secretary of Agriculture jurisdiction over the implementation of the provisions of this bill in the areas where the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior is not set up to function. It is my impression that this amendment will not be objected to by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will, of course, discuss the details of the bill more thoroughly, but I feel that the bill is worthy of the consideration of the House and that the rule, since it is an open one which would allow amendments to be offered from the floor, should be adopted by the House.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask for the immediate consideration of a privileged resolution (H. Res. 226).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby ordered to be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 1,000 additional copies of the Second Progress Report of the Department of Commerce to the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, entitled "Study of Newsprint Expansion: Part II, Newsprint Production from Hardwoods," made to the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, during the 83d Congress, 2d session.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 155) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1955, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 154 by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$150,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$125,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUE OF EDWARD DOUGLASS WHITE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Ad-

ministration, I call up a privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Edward Douglass White Memorial Commission of Louisiana is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Edward Douglass White, of Louisiana, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I notice in the resolution it says "temporarily." Is that the custom?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct. The gentleman from Louisiana, who is the author of the resolution, might better explain the proposition.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the resolution is to use the facilities of the rotunda for the day of the unveiling of the statue, but the statue is not to be placed in the rotunda. That is why we say "temporary" use of the rotunda for that day.

(Mr. WILLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, by the act of August 15, 1876, as amended on March 3, 1921, the Congress provided for a National Statuary Hall in the Capitol of the United States and the President was authorized to invite all States of the Union to furnish statues, not exceeding two in number for each State, of deceased persons who were citizens thereof and illustrious for their historic renown or for distinguished civic or military service, such as each State may deem to be worthy of this national commemoration.

Act 455 of the Legislature of Louisiana of 1952 designated the late Chief Justice White as the second illustrious son of Louisiana to be thus honored, the first having been the late Senator Huey P. Long, whose statue has stood in the Statuary Hall of our Capitol for many years.

The Louisiana Legislature also created the Edward Douglass White Memorial Commission, which is charged with the duty of having erected and installed the statue of the noted jurist. Judge Sam A. LeBlanc, of Napoleonville, a retired member of the Louisiana State Supreme Court, is chairman of the commission; and those serving with him are State Senator Clyde C. Caillouet, of Thibodeaux; G. F. Cunningham, of Shreveport; George W. Hardy, Jr., of Shreveport; and Ben N. Tucker, of Hammond, La.

Active since its organization, the commission decided upon a bronze statue, and after careful consideration of many applicants selected Arthur C. Morgan, of Shreveport, as sculptor. The program for the occasion, together with the date and hour, will be ready for announcement within a short time.

The unveiling ceremonies will soon take place in the rotunda of the Capitol, and it was a great privilege and high honor for me to sponsor legislation granting congressional authority for the exercises, similar legislation having been

offered in the other body by Senators ALLEN J. ELLENDER and RUSSELL B. LONG. I am grateful to the House for the passage of this legislation today.

Chief Justice White was born November 3, 1845, in Lafourche Parish, La., the son of Edward Douglass White and Catherine S. Ringgold, and died in 1921. For almost a half century this great American served his State and Nation ably and devotedly. Beginning his public life as State Senator, his long career included service as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Louisiana, United States Senator, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States for 16 years, and as Chief Justice, presiding over the highest court in the land during the remaining 11 years of his life.

Following his early education at Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., the Jesuit College in New Orleans and Georgetown College in the District of Columbia, young White left school to enlist as a private in the Confederate Army, at the age of 16. After the war he pursued the study of law and was admitted to the Louisiana bar in 1868. Almost immediately he entered politics, was elected to the State senate and later appointed to the State supreme court. His judicial career in Louisiana was cut short, however, owing to the fact that under a new constitution the court was reconstituted, and his term ended.

Following his service on the highest court of his native State, Edward Douglass White was elected to the Senate of the United States. He made his influence felt in that body and evidently was highly esteemed by his colleagues as is evident by the events in his life which took place at that time. A vacancy had occurred on the Supreme Court of the United States, and by virtue of the circumstances which existed it was generally assumed that it would be filled by the appointment of someone from the State of New York. As was expected, President Grover Cleveland did send the name of a prominent New York attorney to the Senate for confirmation, but one of the Senators from that State blocked the nomination on the basis and under the rules of senatorial courtesy. The same thing having happened with respect to the nomination of another New Yorker, it is said that President Cleveland then stated that he would this time send the name of a man whom the Senators would not dare to reject. He sent to the Senate the name of Edward Douglass White of Louisiana, and the nomination was unanimously confirmed.

Thus began an illustrious judicial career which was to run for a period of 27 years. In 1910 came White's greatest honor when President William Howard Taft appointed his friend to the highest judicial office in the land, Chief Justice of the United States. In so doing President Taft ignored a political pattern and tradition. Taft broke away from tradition by selecting a serving Associate Justice instead of designating an outsider, and the Republican President shattered the political pattern by appointing a Democratic Chief Justice. This was the second instance of a Southern Democratic Catholic being ap-

pointed to preside over the highest court of the land, Roger B. Taney having been Chief Justice from 1836 to 1864.

During his service on the bench, Justice White wrote opinions in more than 700 cases. He was an untiring worker, gracious, modest, genial, full of both dignity and humility, and particularly kind and helpful to young members of the bar who appeared before his court. He had a remarkable memory and apparently knew his opinions by heart, including volume and page citations, and seldom referred to the printed page. His skill and energy as a presiding officer expedited the work of the court, and his personality and engaging manner contributed much to resolving of differences of opinion among his colleagues.

Justice White was married in 1894 to Leita Montgomery Kent.

The building in which the late Chief Justice was born, on Bayou Lafourche, between Thibodaux and Napoleonville, has been preserved and on January 23, 1955, with surrounding grounds, was transferred to the State Park Recreation Commission for the establishment and development of a public park and memorial.

We of Louisiana are, indeed, proud and honored that a most distinguished son of our State, by the passage of this bill, is being paid one of the Nation's highest honors.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAPPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (S. J. Res. 18) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker, of Cambridge, Mass., on April 7, 1955, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of 6 years.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAGES FROM THE DOORKEEPER'S DEPARTMENT

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 252) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House the sum of \$16,093 toward paying the salaries of pages

from the Doorkeeper's Department, House of Representatives, fiscal year 1955.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2851) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2851, with Mr. WILLIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration, H. R. 2851, was introduced on January 24 by Congressman JENNINGS, of Virginia. Congressman JENNINGS is a new Member of Congress, and during his very first term in Congress he was elected to membership on the House Committee on Agriculture. During the time he has served on our committee, he has been intensely interested in all matters pertaining to agriculture and has supported all legislation reported by our committee. During the very first month of his service in Congress he introduced the bill now before the House. Action on the bill has been delayed, not because of any lack of interest on the part of its author, but for various reasons. First, because the Secretary of Agriculture and his associates in the Department of Agriculture were not in favor of the bill, and, second, because of the great burden of work which has been assigned to the House Committee on Agriculture during the current session.

Congressman JENNINGS has been constantly interested in this measure. He is a devoted public servant and has regularly attended the sessions of the committee, and on numerous occasions has expressed to me his great interest in this particular bill. Congressman JENNINGS has served with great competency and is a very valuable member of our great committee.

Along with Mr. JENNINGS, 14 or 15 other Members of Congress have introduced bills dealing with this same subject. The names of the authors of the several bills appear in the report. I am certain that all the Members of this House are fully aware of the great activity and interest of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE], and others who have sponsored legislation dealing with this same subject, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the gentlewoman from West Virginia [Mrs. KEEL], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PER-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

(OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE)

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued May 27, 1955
For actions of May 26, 1955
84th-1st, No. 88

CONTENTS

Animal disease.....2	Lands.....4	Price supports.....25
Appropriations..7799,12,15	Legislative program.....9	Public works.....21
Dairy industry.....24	Loans, farm.....1	Reclamation.....8,10
Electrification.....8,11	Low-income farmers.....12	Research.....12,26
Farm-City.....22	Mexican fence.....2	Roads.....23
Farm methods.....18	Minerals.....19	Salt-water research.....3
Food.....26	Mutual security.....5,9	Security.....6
Foreign aid.....5	Newsprint.....13	Territories and
Forestry.....4,12	Organization.....14	possessions.....10
Housing.....9	Personnel.....6,14,20	Veterans' benefits.....17
Labor, farm.....11,16	Postal pay.....9	Wheat.....27

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed bills to decrease interest to 3% on disaster loans, expand salt-water research, authorize Mexican fence, and authorize purchase of Aztec forest lands. Senate committee ordered reported mutual security bill. Sen. Humphrey urged re-evaluation of Ladejinsky case. House passed bill to authorize loans to small reclamation projects with amendment to give USDA responsibility in eastern States. House Rules Committee cleared bills to repeal REA formula and continue Mexican farm labor program. House received various supplemental appropriation estimates.

SENATE

1. FARM LOANS. Passed without amendment S. 1755, to decrease from 5% to 3% the interest rate on USDA disaster loans (pp. 6035-7).
2. MEXICAN FENCE. Passed without amendment S. 76, which authorizes appropriation of \$3,500,000 for completion of a Mexican boundary fence by the Boundary Commission. Sen. Anderson stated that "the Department of Agriculture has now become very much interested in the passage of this proposed legislation" because of animal disease in Mexico and that "the probability is that the Department of Agriculture will assume responsibility" for the project. (p. 6054.)
3. SALT-WATER RESEARCH. Passed without amendment H. R. 2126, to continue the Interior Department program of research on making fresh water from salt water through June 30, 1963; to increase the appropriation authorization from \$2,000,000 to \$6,000,000; to increase the limitation on departmental expenses from \$500,000 to \$1,500,000; and to permit \$500,000 to be expended for research and development in Federal laboratories (pp. 6053-4).
4. FORESTRY. Passed as reported S. 55, to authorize purchase of 98,000 acres of Aztec Land and Cattle Co. lands, in Ariz., which would be administered as national forest lands. These lands have been so administered in the past, but

through court action it was determined that they belonged to the Aztec Co. The bill provides tha the National Forest Reservation Commission set the amount to be paid, not to exceed \$7,409,263. (pp. 6055-63.)

Passed as reported S. 1464, to authorize the Interior Department to acquire rights-of-way and existing connecting roads adjacent to public lands to provide timber access roads to public lands under Interior's jurisdiction (pp. 6049-50).

5. FOREIGN AID. The Foreign Relations Committee, by a 13-2 vote, ordered reported the mutual security bill, with authorization of \$3.408 billion (p. D473).

6. PERSONNEL. Sen. Humphrey commended creation of a permanent security review committee in USDA, stated that such a committee should have been established earlier, requested a re-evaluation of the Ladejinsky case by the committee, and inserted a Washington Evening Star article on this matter (pp. 6067-8).

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendments S. 2061, a new postal pay bill (S. Rept. 382)(p. 6027).

7. STATE, JUSTICE, JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 5502 (S. Rept. 378)(p. 6027). The bill was made the unfinished business of the Senate (p. 6055).

8. RECLAMATION. Passed as reported S. 180, to authorize the Washita River Basin project, Okla. (pp. 6038-9).

Passed as reported H. R. 103, to provide for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies (p. 6049).

Sen. Neuberger spoke in favor of the Hells Canyon Dam proposal and mentioned its rural-electrification value (pp. 6029-30).

9. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, as announced by Sen. Johnson: Today, no legislative business; Tues., State-Justice appropriation bill and probably the mutual security bill; "early consideration" of the new postal pay bill; and probably next week, housing bill (pp. 6057-8).

HOUSE

10. RECLAMATION. Passed, 166 to 48, with amendments H. R. 5881, to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects (pp. 6082-6108). Agreed, 85 to 23, to an amendment by Rep. Jones, Ala., authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to administer the proposed program in the eastern States (pp. 6103-5). Also agreed to an amendment by Rep. Aspinall to provide for submission of projects to the entire Congress instead of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees (pp. 6105-6). Rejected, 62 to 229, a motion by Rep. Hoeven to recommit the bill to limit the scope of the bill to the 17 western reclamation States (p. 6107). Previously rejected, 27 to 57, an amendment by Rep. Saylor having the same purpose as the Hoeven motion (pp. 6098-6102) and also an amendment by Rep. Saylor to extend the bill to Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa (p. 6103). Rejected, 33-54, a Saylor amendment (to the Jones amendment) to include Texas as one of the western reclamation States (p. 6105).

11. FARM LABOR; ELECTRIFICATION. The House Rules Committee reported resolutions for the consideration of H. R. 3822, to provide for continuation of the Mexican farm labor program, and H. R. 5376, to amend the REA funds-distribution formula (pp. 6082, 6078-9).

H. R. 5881

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 27 (legislative day, MAY 2), 1955

Received and referred, under authority of the order of the Senate of May 27 (legislative day, May 2), 1955, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

AN ACT

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the purpose of this Act is to encourage State and local
4 participation in the development of projects under the Federal
5 reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in
6 the development of similar projects in all forty-eight States
7 and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska by non-Federal
8 organizations.

9 SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

10 (a) The term “construction” shall include rehabilita-
11 tion and betterment.

1 (b) The term "Federal reclamation laws" shall mean
2 the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amend-
3 atory thereof or supplementary thereto.

4 (c) The term "organization" shall mean a State or a
5 department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a
6 conservancy district, irrigation district, waters users' associa-
7 tion, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar
8 organization which has capacity to contract with the United
9 States under the Federal reclamation laws.

10 (d) The term "project" shall mean (i) any complete
11 irrigation undertaking or distinct unit of such an undertak-
12 ing or a rehabilitation and betterment program for an exist-
13 ing irrigation project, authorized to be constructed pursuant
14 to the Federal reclamation laws and (ii) any similar under-
15 taking proposed to be constructed by an organization. The
16 term "project" shall not include any such undertaking, unit,
17 or program the cost of which exceeds \$5,000,000: *Provided*,
18 That projects, the estimated cost of which is more than
19 \$5,000,000 but less than \$10,000,000, may qualify under
20 this Act if the applicant organization is ready, able, and will-
21 ing to finance otherwise than by loan or grant under this
22 Act all costs in excess of the amount of the loan or grant
23 which would be made under this Act if the estimated con-
24 struction cost were \$5,000,000: *And provided further*, That
25 nothing contained in this definition shall preclude the mak-

1 ing of a grant not in excess of \$5,000,000 in accordance with
2 the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of this Act, to organiza-
3 tions which qualify for the same and which are not applicants
4 for a loan under this Act.

5 (e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of
6 the Interior with respect to projects located in the States of
7 Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana,
8 Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma,
9 Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming,
10 and the term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of Agri-
11 culture with respect to projects located in any other State
12 or in the Territory of Hawaii or of Alaska.

13 (f) The term "State" or "States" shall include the Ter-
14 ritories of Hawaii and Alaska.

15 SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of
16 the benefits provided in this Act shall submit a proposal
17 therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he
18 shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by
19 a payment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining
20 the proposal.

21 SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construc-
22 tion of a project which has not theretofore been authorized for
23 construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set
24 forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail
25 comparable to those included in preauthorization reports re-

1 quired for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been
2 submitted for review by the State or States in which the proj-
3 ect is located in like manner as provided in subsection (c),
4 section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887),
5 except that the review may be limited to the State or States
6 in which the project is located if the proposal is one for
7 rehabilitation and betterment of an existing project only; and
8 shall include a proposed allocation of capital costs to func-
9 tions such that costs for facilities used for a single purpose
10 shall be allocated to that purpose and costs for facilities used
11 for more than one purpose shall be so allocated among the
12 purposes served that each purpose will share equitably in
13 the costs of such joint facilities.

14 (b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that
15 the organization already holds or can acquire all lands
16 and interests in land (except public and other lands and
17 interests in land owned by the United States which are within
18 the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject
19 to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water neces-
20 sary for the successful construction, operation, and mainte-
21 nance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing
22 to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this Act
23 such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall
24 include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and

1 rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have
2 advised is proper in the circumstances.

3 (c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the
4 Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appro-
5 priate State agency designated by him) to be financially
6 feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the
7 requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the pro-
8 visions of this Act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to
9 negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as pro-
10 vided in section 5; but no such contract shall be executed by
11 the Secretary prior to sixty calendar days (which sixty days,
12 however, shall not include days on which either the House
13 of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of
14 an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain)
15 from the date on which the project proposal has been sub-
16 mitted to the both branches of the Congress: *Provided*, That
17 the said submission may, after the close of any session of the
18 Congress, be made to the chairman and ranking minority
19 member of the committees to which the matter has been
20 referred and in that event, or in the event that the sixty-
21 day period aforesaid is broken by an adjournment of the Con-
22 gress, the contract shall not be executed until the expiration
23 of sixty calendar days from the date of such submission

1 or from the date of its original submission to the branches
2 of Congress as hereinbefore provided. The Secretary at
3 the time of submitting the project proposal to Con-
4 gress or at the time of his determination that the
5 requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the
6 provisions of this Act, may reserve from use or disposition
7 inimical to the project any lands and interests in land
8 owned by the United States which are within his adminis-
9 trative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and
10 which are required for use by the project. Any such reser-
11 vation shall expire at the end of two years unless the repay-
12 ment contract provided for in section 5 of this Act shall have
13 been executed.

14 (d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to
15 financial feasibility, emergency, or urgent need for the project,
16 whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irriga-
17 tion water for an existing irrigation project, whether the pro-
18 posal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project
19 works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irri-
20 gation or drainage. All project works and facilities con-
21 structed under this Act, except such portions that are dedi-
22 cated to flood control or other functions which would in the
23 case of a Federal reclamation project be considered non-
24 reimbursable, shall remain under the jurisdiction and control

1 of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of
2 the repayment contract.

3 SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under
4 the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this Act shall
5 set out, among other things—

6 (a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made
7 to the organization and the time and method of making
8 the same available to the organization. Said loan shall
9 not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project
10 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclama-
11 tion project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable
12 functions under general provisions of law applicable to
13 such projects;

14 (b) the maximum amount of any grant to be
15 accorded the organization and the time and method of
16 paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall
17 not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of construct-
18 ing the project which, if it were being constructed as a
19 Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable
20 to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions
21 of law applicable to such projects;

22 (c) a plan of repayment by the organization of
23 (1) the sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from
24 the date when the principal benefits of the project first

1 become available; (2) interest, at the average rate, as de-
2 termined by the Secretary of the Treasury, paid on the
3 long-term interest-bearing marketable securities of the
4 United States outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal
5 year preceding the date on which the contract is executed,
6 on that pro rata share of the loan which is attributable to
7 furnishing irrigation benefits in each particular year to
8 land held in private ownership by any one owner in
9 excess of one hundred and sixty irrigable acres; and
10 (3) in the case of any project involving an allocation
11 to domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or
12 commercial power produced as an element of the project
13 and incidental to its full development, interest on the
14 unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the
15 loan at a rate as determined in (2) above;

16 (d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant
17 predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable
18 functions is made, in accordance with regulations with
19 respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal
20 department or agency primarily concerned with those
21 functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such
22 regulations, for operation by the United States or for
23 repayment to the United States of the amount of any
24 such grant; and

25 (e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem

1 necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security
2 for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as afore-
3 said. The liability of the United States under any con-
4 tract entered into pursuant to this Act shall be contingent
5 upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the
6 same, and every such contract shall so recite.

7 SEC. 6. Any proposal with respect to the construction of
8 a project which has theretofore been authorized for construc-
9 tion under the Federal reclamation laws shall be made in like
10 manner as a proposal under section 4 of this Act, but the
11 Secretary may waive such requirements of subsections (a)
12 and (b) of that section as he finds to be duplicative of, or
13 rendered unnecessary or impossible by, action already taken
14 by the United States. Upon approval of any such proposal
15 by the Secretary he may negotiate and execute a contract
16 which conforms, as nearly as may be, to the provisions of
17 section 5 of this Act.

18 SEC. 7. Upon request of an organization which has
19 made or intends to make a proposal under this Act, the
20 head of any Federal department or agency may make avail-
21 able to the organization any existent engineering, economic,
22 or hydrologic information and printed material that it may
23 have and that will be useful in connection with the planning,
24 design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the
25 project concerned. The cost of any plans, specifications, and

1 other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pur-
2 suant to this section and the cost of making and administer-
3 ing any loan under this Act shall, to the extent that they
4 would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project con-
5 structed under the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as
6 a loan and covered in the provisions of the contract entered
7 into under section 5 of this Act unless they are otherwise
8 paid for by the organization.

9 SEC. 8. The planning and construction of projects under-
10 taken pursuant to this Act shall be subject to all procedural
11 requirements and other provisions of the Act of August 14,
12 1946 (60 Stat. 1080).

13 SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to perform any
14 and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as
15 may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions
16 of this Act.

17 SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropri-
18 ated, such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,-
19 000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act. All such
20 appropriations shall remain available until expended and
21 shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under
22 this Act, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove
23 provided.

1 SEC. 11. This Act shall be a supplement to the Federal
2 reclamation laws.

Passed the House of Representatives May 26, 1955.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

MAY 27 (legislative day, May 2), 1955

Received and referred, under authority of the order of the Senate of May 27 (legislative day, May 2), 1955, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

agreed to give increases which in effect amount to an increase of \$5,000 across the board with 1 or 2 exceptions, 1 exception being that in the case of the juvenile court judge, her salary is increased by this conference report from \$11,800 to \$18,000 and the judge of the tax court is increased almost accordingly.

There has been some question with reference to comparing salaries of the judges of the municipal court here with the salaries paid judges in the various States. Let me say there is not a municipality in this Nation which pays salaries to their municipal judges comparable to the salaries contained in this conference report.

Let us take a look at the salaries paid the trial judges in the various States and remember that these trial judges in the various States are judges of courts of unlimited or general jurisdiction, while the judges of the municipal court here have only limited jurisdiction. They have jurisdiction over misdemeanor cases arising in the District of Columbia and they sit as committing magistrates in felony cases, binding the defendants charged with such felony over to the United States district court for trial. They have jurisdiction in civil cases of amounts up to \$3,000. That is the extent of their jurisdiction.

The gentleman from Minnesota intimated that we in the South pay unusually low salaries to our officials, therefore no comparison should be made with those southern States. But let me make a comparison with some of the northern States with reference to salaries paid to their judges who have general jurisdiction. Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that if this conference report is agreed to this morning the municipal judges of the District of Columbia will draw a larger salary than every trial judge in every State of this Union except in three States, those three Northern States being New York, Illinois, and Pennsylvania.

The appeals court judges in this bill will be paid \$19,000. If the House adopts this conference report, then these appeals court judges which pass on matters appealed from the trial courts in question will draw more money than the judges of the State supreme courts of every State in this Nation with the exception of five States. Those States are: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and California.

Let me list a few of the States where the supreme court judges do not get as much money as these judges of the court of appeals for the District of Columbia will get if this conference report is adopted: Massachusetts, Michigan, Connecticut, Texas, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Rhode Island, Virginia, Maryland, Washington, Colorado, Delaware, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Kentucky, Tennessee, and all other States except five States of this Union.

Mr. Speaker, I think this conference report should be recommitted to the conferees with instruction that the managers on the part of the House insist on the amendments adopted by the House.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I supported what I considered to be a reasonable increase in the salary of these judges when this bill was before the House the other day, in spite of the fact that in some cases many of us thought that actually it was too much. As a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia which considered this legislation, I think I can say with some degree of truth, that the committee considered the Senate figure entirely too much, and it was only after these figures were reduced to those which were carried in the House bill that the committee agreed reluctantly—and I say that advisedly—to go along with this bill.

Now, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] who has just presented the case for the House bill to you, has shown to you the comparable salaries received by these municipal court judges who have jurisdiction somewhat comparable to justices of the peace out in the States and compared with the rest of our States' judiciary. Now let us look at this for just a moment.

Do you know that if this bill passes as the committee of conference has reported it, the lowest salary carried in this bill is in excess of the salary paid to every governor in the United States with the exception of seven? Now, are we going to vote to accept the figures of the committee of conference, when those figures pay these municipal court judges more than our governors are drawing?

Now, let us see what this conference report does. Incidentally, I intend to offer a motion to recommit this report to the committee of conference with instructions that they insist on the amendments adopted by the House.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Is it not true that most governors have a mansion or other additional benefits that a judge does not get?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It is also true that governors have to run for reelection and that they also have to take care of their constituents, and the gentleman, who is in politics and has to run for reelection, should know the expense involved in that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Only a few days ago we heard a great deal of weeping and wailing in the House because some \$2 million or \$3 million was knocked out of the District appropriation bill. Where is it proposed to get the money to pay these fantastic salaries?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The committee was unanimous in opposition to the Senate figures.

Mr. Speaker, what does this bill do? Let us see what kind of a compromise came out of the committee of conference. I may say, figuratively speaking, the last one going in met the first one coming out with surrender in his hands. At the present time, the municipal court judges are receiving \$13,500. The Sen-

ate bill wanted to bump them up to \$19,000. We gave them \$16,000. The conference committee gave them \$18,000. At present the judges of the juvenile court are receiving \$11,800. The Senate wanted to give them \$18,500. The House gave them \$14,800. The conferees compromised by reducing the Senate figure \$500 to \$18,000. So, in the end, they are raised from \$11,800 to \$18,000.

You know, some might say that the House gave them all the money in the world, and then the Senate tried to double it.

Let us look at the municipal court of appeals. Remember that all of these are courts of limited jurisdiction. They do not handle any civil cases involving over \$3,000. They handle only criminal misdemeanors.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. FORRESTER. Is it not true that they are not only courts of limited jurisdiction, but they are the inferior courts of the District? Is that not true?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. As I understand it; yes, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Unqualifiedly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi moves to recommit the conference report on the bill (S. 727) to the conference committee with instructions to the Managers on the part of the House that they insist on the amendments adopted in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 84, noes 37.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present. The doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 170, nays 165, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]
YEAS—170

Abbott
Alexander
Alger
Allen, Ill.
Andersen,
H. Carl

Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Baldwin
Bass, Tenn.

Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bentley

Berry
Betts
Blitch
Boland
Bolton,
Frances P.
Bosch
Bow
Boykin
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brownson
Budge
Burdick
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Carlyle
Chase
Chatham
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Coon
Corbett
Cramer
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Deane
Dies
Dixon
Dorn, S. C.
Doyle
Durham
Ellsworth
Fernandez
Fisher
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Gary
Gathings
Gentry
George
Gross
Gubser
Hagen
Hale

Haley
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Hayworth
Henderson
Henong
Hiestand
Hill
Hoeven
Holmes
Holt
Horan
Huddleston
Jarman
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Kean
Keating
Kilgore
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Latham
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Long
Lovre
McCulloch
McIntire
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Magnuson
Marshall
Matthews
Minshall
Murray, Tenn.
Norblad
O'Konski
Ostertag
Pelly
Pfof
Phillips
Pilcher
Poage
Poff

NAYS—165

Addonizio
Albert
Andresen,
August H.
Andrews
Bailey
Baker
Bass, N. H.
Becker
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill
Buchanan
Buckley
Burnside
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Carrigg
Chelf
Christopher
Chudoff
Cooley
Cooper
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Dempsey
Denton
Devereux
Diggs
Dollinger
Dondero
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan

Fenton
Fine
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Gavin
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Gregory
Harris
Hays, Ark.
Hébert
Hinshaw
Hoffman, Ill.
Holfield
Hosmer
Hull
Hyde
Ikard
Karsten
Kearns
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Landrum
Lane
Lankford
McCarthy
McCormack
McDonough
McDowell
McGregor
McMillan
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Mahan
Martin
Meador
Morrow

Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Natcher
Nicholson
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Neill
Passman
Perkins
Preston
Price
Priest
Quigley
Rabaut
Rains
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reiss
Richards
Rodino
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sadlak
Sheehan
Sheppard
Sieminski
Simpson, Ill.
Sisk
Smith, Va.
Springer
Steed
Sullivan
Talle
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry

Trimble
Tumulty
Udall
Vanik
Vinson
Vorys

Abernethy
Adair
Allen, Calif.
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Ayres
Barden
Barrett
Bolton,
Oliver P.
Bonner
Bowler
Byrd
Canfield
Carnahan
Cederberg
Celler
Clark
Colmer
Coudert
Cretella
Curtis, Mo.
Davidson
Delaney
Derounian
Dingell
Dodd
Dolliver
Donohue
Dowdy
Eberharter
Edmondson

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Anfuso against.
Mr. Lanham for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mrs. Green of Oregon against.

Mr. Norrell for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Delaney against.

Mr. Winstead for, with Mr. O'Brien of New York against.

Mr. Shuford for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Jennings for, with Mr. Friedel against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Taber.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Taylor.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Jenkins.

Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Carnahan with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Davidson with Mr. Cole.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Bowles with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Byrd with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Wainwright.

Mr. Dodd with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Dolliver.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Osmer.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wolverton.

Mr. Yates with Mr. Allen of California.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Pillion.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Cretella.

Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Coudert.

NOT VOTING—99

Fjare
Flynt
Friedel
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gwinn
Halleck
Harrison, Nebr.
Hays, Ohio
Heslton
Hess
Hillings
Hoffman, Mich.
Holtzman
Hope
Jackson
James
Jenkins
Jennings
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Kearney
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Knutson
Lanham
Lesinski
McConnell
Mailliard

Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Zablocki
Zelenko

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. McConnell
Mr. Patman with Mr. James.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Spence with Mr. Judd.

Messrs. GARY, GATHINGS, Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. CHRISTOPHER, WIER, MILLER of Maryland, and HOSMER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDING TITLE V OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 255, Rept. No. 643) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3822) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by striking out the termination date. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5881, with Mr. PRESTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 23 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second time this subject matter has been before this body. In the last Congress a similar bill passed the House under suspension of the rules. It was favorably voted out of the Senate Committee on Interior and failed of passage in the Senate in the closing days of the last session. The measure in the last session was authored by my distinguished friend, and the

chairman of our committee at that time, the gentleman from Nebraska, Dr. MILLER, who is a coauthor of the legislation now before you. The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. YOUNG] is also a coauthor of this legislation, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] has a bill for a similar purpose pending before the House Committee on Agriculture. If this legislation is approved by the House, it would take the place of the measure introduced by the gentleman from Alabama who is, as I understand, supporting this legislation.

At the other side of the Capitol similar, although not precisely identical, legislation has been introduced by Senator MALONE, Senator ANDERSON, Senator KUCHEL, Senator GOLDWATER, Senator DWORSHAK, Senator BARRETT, Senator JACKSON, and Senator WATKINS.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation has the approval of the Department of the Interior. Their report appearing in the committee report now before you approves the general purposes and objectives of this legislation. So, so far as I know, Mr. Chairman, the legislation has had favorable consideration on both sides of the aisle as well as by the executive departments.

Now, the simple way to state the purposes and the objectives of this legislation is to say that it is to permit local agencies to plan and to construct small irrigation projects with the same money, but we believe less of it, as that which would be used for the same purpose by the Bureau of Reclamation. In short, this legislation authorizes the substitution of a local public agency as the construction agency on small projects in the place and stead of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The basic premise of this bill is that these small projects are inherently local in character, simple in engineering and that they can be built better and cheaper by local agencies. Under the present reclamation law, the Bureau of Reclamation could build any project which would be constructed under this proposed legislation, but our experience has shown that the Bureau of Reclamation, being a national governmental agency, is not geared to build small projects. Not long ago we passed through this House a bill on the Consent Calendar, to authorized local irrigation districts to build their own distribution systems which, under the present reclamation law, are being built by the Bureau of Reclamation. This is a companion bill which deals with small projects costing \$10 million or less.

Our observation has been that when the Bureau of Reclamation undertakes to build a distribution system or, in connection with this proposed legislation a small project, that the cost goes up because of the redtape and the type of review that is necessary in a national organization. As an illustration, in one case we found that the administrative costs of building a distribution system in California as a part of the Central Valley project were 47 percent of the total capital cost of the project. And it is not unusual at all to have those administrative costs run from 20 to 30 percent.

That is true because they have an office where the project is being built, a regional office; then they have an office at Denver and they have one back here in Washington.

It is my belief that local agencies could build these small projects and that they could save that money but, in addition to that, they would take a good deal of the gingerbread out of the engineering and planning of these small projects. As a consequence they would be built not only cheaper, but it would be possible to build more of them. And they would be built sufficiently well to meet the requirements of the local people.

This bill, in effect, provides for a partnership arrangement between the Federal Government and the local governmental agency in the construction of these small projects, simple in engineering, inherently local in character, and therefore susceptible of local planning, engineering, and construction on a more efficient basis than could be done by a national organization.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am going into a section-by-section discussion of the bill, but if the gentleman has a question to ask at this point, I am glad to yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have just a few questions as to the overall effects of the bill. In the first place, this bill would put under the purview of the Reclamation Act the 31 eastern States, would it not?

Mr. ENGLE. In its present form, it would. Let me continue to say that I understand that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] is going to offer an amendment to substitute the Secretary of Agriculture in the Eastern States, leaving only the Western States under the Bureau of Reclamation and the Interior Department. As far as I am personally concerned I would not undertake to tell the people of the East or in the South which agency should administer this act so far as they are concerned. If they prefer the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior, it is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. My second question is, Why should we bring the 31 States, as in this bill, into this program whatsoever? What do you obtain by so doing? It seems to me you are in direct contradiction with what we already have under the law in the Watershed Protection Act. Why bring reclamation into the picture in the eastern half of the United States? Does not the gentleman think there will be considerable duplication all along the line? At least, that is the opinion of men whom I respect down in the Department of Agriculture.

Would not the gentleman be in agreement simply to limit this to the 17 reclamation States? If the gentleman will do so, I do not intend to fight this bill, but I will distinctly say to the gentleman that this \$100 million measure, I feel, is an extreme duplication of the measure I had the honor to present in the first place to the Congress of the

United States having to do with watershed protection. In this particular program you are creating two different sorts of groups. Is it not a fact that in this program it is not necessary for the local interests to put up 50 percent as in the Watershed Protection Act?

Mr. ENGLE. If the gentleman will ask one question at a time, I will try to answer him.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am trying to get the overall picture. I am trying to determine whether I shall fight this bill and attempt to kill it or whether the proponents of the bill are willing to limit it to the 17 reclamation States.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman asked to begin with whether or not this bill duplicated the Watershed Act which was passed last year. The answer to that is "No."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I say that that is the word that I have from the soil-conservation people, in whom I have confidence. They state about this bill:

It appears that there is a direct conflict with the Upstream Watershed Act which this Congress passed in the last session after years of study.

I do not think the gentleman wants duplication in this great Government of ours. Would he not be agreeable to limit the scope of this bill to the 17 reclamation States?

Mr. ENGLE. If the gentleman will ask one question at a time, I will try to answer him. The first question he asked me was whether or not this bill overlaps and duplicates the Watershed Act. There may be some disagreement about it, but, in my opinion, it does not. The Watershed Act is a flood-control act. It provides for small restraining dams in the upper reaches of these streams, with a storage capacity of not more than 5,000 acre-feet of water. This bill actually supplements and adds to and fills a gap left so far as that program is concerned.

The Flood Control Act is not basically an irrigation law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. From all I see, Mr. Chairman, I had better take another 10 minutes. I am very interested in not having the opposition of my good friend, who should, in my opinion, be supporting this legislation.

This does not conflict, it supplements. The gentleman says, Why did we do it? The Interior Department came in, and in its report recommended, if the gentleman will read it in the committee report before him, that this bill not be limited in its beneficial operation to the 17 Western States but be applicable to the whole United States.

I was, of course, familiar with the legislation that has been introduced and is pending now before the Committee on Agriculture, introduced by my friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. My personal interest, of course, is in the West. Naturally I want to do the thing that will benefit and help the West. But I want to help my eastern colleagues, too.

I think this bill mechanically is a good bill, because it will save the Federal Government money and it will actually contribute to the more efficient building of these small projects. But if the people in the East and in the South, who are beginning to feel the pinch of the lack of water as they never did before, step up and stay, "We would like to have some of that, too; we would like to have that kind of program down in our area to help us out," I am not going to close the gate on them. As a matter of fact, I welcome their participation. I think it is a sound and proper thing to do; and although I would not want to see this bill defeated because these other 31 States are in it, nevertheless we are glad to have them in the bill. What I suggest to my friend is, if he does not want the eastern part of the United States, the area outside the 17 Western States, in this bill, then he might offer an amendment at the appropriate place to strike them out and test that question on its merits alone, but not to oppose this bill just because the other States are in the bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The main desire of the gentleman in connection with this proposed legislation is to make it possible, is it not, to afford small organizations the right to get Federal assistance in relation to irrigation projects. That is correct, is it not? The ladies and gentlemen from the West here today are interested in getting that added to what they already have today in the law.

Mr. ENGLE. It changes the mechanics.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly. In other words, my only objection to the bill is that it goes much further than it has any right to go in relation to bringing the Department of Interior, so to speak, into the 31 States in which today it is not interested. Are we going to have the Department of Interior opening up regional offices and area offices throughout the United States, which it would be necessary to create simply because of the proposed legislation?

Mr. ENGLE. I have already told the gentleman that an amendment is going to be offered. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection at all to that. These people in the East and in the South are, in my opinion, perfectly capable of choosing the department or agency of government which they would most prefer. It is in the bill this way because the bill came out of our committee—the Interior Committee, and the Department of the Interior recommended it in its report. If they are not satisfied, all they have to do is to put in an amendment to change it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman refers to an amendment. Now that amendment does not do what I am asking should be done, and that is simply to take these 31 States out of the purview of this bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Yes, it does this—it puts the administration of this act under the Department of Agriculture rather than the Department of the Interior.

I now yield to my friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], who has been trying to get the floor.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I want to say to the gentleman from California that this bill is not in conflict with the flood-control act of 1944 or with the water-facilities act which was passed last year or with the watershed and water-protection-works bill which was passed last year, nor is it in conflict with any general reclamation law that is now on the statute books.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Has the Department of the Interior approved the bill, as it was reported by the gentleman's committee? My understanding is that no department of the Federal Government has approved this bill.

Mr. ENGLE. That is not true.

Mr. COOLEY. Then my question is: Do you have a report from the Department of Interior approving the bill, as reported by the committee?

Mr. ENGLE. Ordinarily, you do not get a report from the department after you report a bill—you get it before, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. COOLEY. Did you have a report approving it before the bill was reported?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes, we have a report which was printed in the committee's report, which is available to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Was it a favorable report?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes, it was. In addition to that, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Aandahl testified in support of this legislation. Moreover, Mr. Dexheimer, Commissioner of Reclamation, appeared before our committee and testified in support of this legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask another question? Was the Jones amendment considered in the gentleman's committee before the bill was reported?

Mr. ENGLE. It seems to me that was offered. I would have to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. COOLEY. Has the Secretary of Agriculture approved the bill with the Jones amendment or has he approved the Jones amendment?

Mr. ENGLE. I would have to ask the gentleman from Alabama to answer that question.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from Kansas, the ranking minority member of the committee, held consultations with the Department of Agriculture and received approval. I wish the gentleman was here to attest to the conversations and the communications he has had with the Department.

Mr. COOLEY. I wish he were here too.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I regret exceedingly that these questions would come up so late. I had hoped in my conversations with the members of the Committee on Agriculture to have resolved the differences that have now arisen.

Mr. COOLEY. I was wondering whether or not the gentleman had resolved the difference in his own committee. This amendment apparently came

as an afterthought by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from North Carolina was present in the Committee on Rules when the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], was there and testified for this bill and pointed out specifically what the Department of Agriculture had said in approving this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I understand that the Department of Agriculture has just today started to study the situation so as to determine just what the situation will be in the event the Jones amendment is adopted. I am anxious for these water facilities to be provided in the East or in the South, or wherever they are needed, but as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] just pointed out, I think we should be careful to avoid any possible duplication.

Then there comes the question of interest rates, and financing, and improvements. Under the Water Facilities Act, they carry the legal rate of interest and are in the nature of self-liquidating projects. Here they are required to pay only the interest rate that the Government is required to pay.

Mr. ENGLE. There is no interest charged by the Federal Government on irrigation and reclamation projects, except for municipal water and for those facilities dedicated to power.

Mr. COOLEY. In addition thereto, the sponsors are not required to put up any money.

Mr. ENGLE. No. The sponsors are putting up all the land acquisition, the rights of way, do all the planning and engineering. We think it will run as much as 25 percent.

Mr. COOLEY. As I understand it we have no report from the Secretary of Agriculture favoring this bill, even with the Jones amendment in it.

Mr. ENGLE. I have no report. As a matter of fact, I would say to the gentleman that when we reported the bill out there was no necessity for it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the gentleman be willing to put off decision on this bill until next Thursday, when we have a full attendance of the House present? I think this is too far-reaching to be put in here just ahead of Memorial Day, when many of the Members are necessarily absent from the House. I am saying that in a spirit of friendliness. I want to help the people from the West to get what they want out of this legislation; that is, to help out on these small irrigation projects. But I certainly cannot agree to extend the purview of the Interior Department to the 31 eastern States just to get this particular piece of legislation passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. ENGLE. I yield myself 5 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I understood the gentleman from California now agrees with

the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] that the Interior Department should not extend itself all over the 31 additional States?

Mr. ENGLE. I do not say I agree with that. I stated that whenever the people in the eastern States went to select a Government agency, such as the Department of Agriculture, it is not my business to tell them that they should have the Interior Department down there, notwithstanding what the Interior Department itself says. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], says he does not think this act should apply to the East. But his argument is not with me, because as far as I am concerned they can be in or out as they choose.

Mr. COOLEY. I will vote for the Jones amendment and I will vote against the bill if the Jones amendment is not adopted. The gentleman will say to the House that unless we adopt the Jones amendment the Interior Department will be extended into 31 additional States?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. And if it is adopted, then the Department of Agriculture will run the show in those 31 States?

Mr. ENGLE. That is right. On the other hand, it is not contemplated that this legislation is going to set up any vast bureaucracy to be swarming around in the South or anywhere else. The engineering is done by local people. The land acquisition is done by local people. Applications for a loan are submitted to the Department of the Interior. All they have to do is to determine first whether or not the program is engineeringly sound, on which practically all the work has been done; and secondly, whether or not the agency making the application has repayment capabilities to pay back the loan. They do not need a vast agency swarming around setting up regional offices here and there. Notwithstanding that, since the Department of Agriculture is a major agency in the southern States as well as in the eastern States it would perhaps be a little easier if they did take charge of the matter.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I ask the gentleman to yield to me briefly because of the fact that I must immediately go to a conference on the Atomic Energy bill and I do not want to lose sight of the underlying principle of this bill. We passed this bill practically without opposition last year. It sent to the Senate and was placed on the calendar of the Senate, but we lost it.

This is all there is to this bill: A large agency of Government finds it impossible to gear itself down to small projects without adding a great deal of administrative cost, a great deal of time, and a great deal of money. This is primarily in line with the philosophy of this side of the aisle. The gentleman from Minnesota and myself would be very much in favor of the basic intent of this bill. This supplemental question should be decided by itself, but certainly those who are for economy, efficiency, and even

merit, we may add, should vote for this bill.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to know if the gentleman from California intends to support the Jones amendment so as to turn 31 States into Agriculture rather than Interior.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is a matter which each Member must decide for himself. I think I would be inclined to vote for the Jones amendment. I think it is a matter for the people involved to decide, and we should accept their views as to whether they want to have it in Agriculture or Interior. My personal opinion is that I shall vote for the Jones amendment.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. I just want to clear up a couple of preliminary questions. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that the Department of the Interior is in favor of this bill?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman look at the report of the committee, particularly the last paragraph of the letter from the Department to your committee which begins at the bottom of page 7 and reads:

Because we are informed that there is a particular urgency for the submission of the views of this Department on H. R. 104 and H. R. 384 and at the special request of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, this report is being submitted prior to clearance through the Bureau of the Budget. In these circumstances, no commitment can be made concerning the relation of the bills or of the views herein expressed to the program of the President.

With those last two sentences in mind, will the gentleman please tell me and the members of this committee how he reconciles his statement that the Department is in favor of this bill when the only official communication on record states that the Department makes no commitment?

Mr. ENGLE. I cited the exact facts in the case and that is that the Department has approved this legislation, sent their witnesses up and testified for it.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true that the Bureau of the Budget last year approved this very legislation that is before this committee at this time?

Mr. ENGLE. The legislation for an identical purpose though not similar precisely in language.

If we sit around and wait for the Bureau of the Budget we probably would not legislate around here at all.

Mr. DONOVAN. Forget the Bureau of the Budget. How does the gentleman reconcile this simple language: "In these circumstances, no commitment can be made," with the statement made by him as chairman of the committee that the Department is in favor of the bill?

Mr. ENGLE. That is exactly what I said, and that is the truth. The De-

partment is in favor of the bill and came up here and testified for it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Notwithstanding the fact that in writing they say they make no commitments?

Mr. ENGLE. They say they make no commitment with reference to the Bureau of the Budget. Of course, they do not. The Bureau of the Budget speaks in a formal and technical sense for the views of the President, you may say. But that is not what I said. I said the Department of the Interior favors this bill and appeared and testified for it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman from New York should have read the second paragraph on the first page which says:

The general position of this Department with respect to these two bills is the same as that which we took with respect to H. R. 5301, 83d Congress, in its report of April 16, 1954, to your committee.

These are in accord with what I understand to be the principles enunciated in H. R. 5301 encouraging participation of State and local agencies.

Mr. DONOVAN. Let me say to the gentleman from Nebraska that I have read the whole statement and if I ever ran into a lot of double talk multiplied 40 times I find it in that statement.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They appeared before the committee after the date of this letter and testified for the bill.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman and his committee for one of the greatest steps forward I have seen taken toward the solution of our nationwide water problem. I would like to ask the gentleman's indulgence for two questions which are of particular interest to the district I represent.

If bonds have been sold by the local agency for an irrigation project but construction has not started, can that local agency then receive benefits under this bill?

Mr. ENGLE. I think any project under \$10 million would qualify where construction had not commenced.

Mr. GUBSER. Is the language of this bill intended to include projects where water is stored underground by the percolation method for later withdrawal and application to crops?

Mr. ENGLE. That type of project would fall within the reclamation law and would come within the purview of this bill. We have one out in California, the Santa Maria project, authorized last year which involved precisely that principle.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I would like to ask the gentleman if this bill would in anywise affect the President's program or that

of the Department of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget. That is, whether this bill is passed or not passed, the present program will remain exactly as it is?

Mr. ENGLE. That is right, except to the extent that we are not getting anywhere with small projects for two reasons. First, they do not have the political muscle to pull themselves through, and, second, there is the redtape and expense involved in connection with the planning and authorization of these projects where the Bureau of Reclamation does all the engineering and planning. This puts them in the picture on a partnership basis. They do the planning, they do the engineering, they acquire the land and then they say: "Instead of you building this, we will build it, but you put up the same amount of money you would put up if you built, only it will be less money, and the cost of building will be cheaper."

Mr. POAGE. I want to congratulate the gentleman for going farther than we have. I am very much interested in the small-projects bill that we passed a year ago, as the gentleman will remember.

Mr. ENGLE. I do remember that.

Mr. POAGE. I feel that has not had the support in the department that it should have had, but I think it was a step in the right direction. I am glad to see that this bill goes further because it does provide for payment much further than that bill did.

I want to be sure, though, that this bill does not in anywise interfere with the present program. If we pass this program and agree to the Jones amendment, in those States that are not left under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior there would still be exactly the same law that now is applicable as regards the bigger projects?

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman is 100 percent correct. This only provides an alternative method for building small projects. The Bureau of Reclamation could still build them.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I would like to ask the gentleman just one question: In view of the fact that the State of Oklahoma, under its constitution, has no enabling act whereby we could participate unless it is a statewide project, even though the State of Oklahoma will not make a personal guaranty, will it still be possible for municipalities, districts, or groups to come in under this bill?

Mr. ENGLE. It would be possible for any public agency to come in which qualifies under the second section of this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As I read this bill, it would take care of the water-conservation projects where they are trying to replenish the water underground. Is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. That can now be done under the reclamation law, and anything

that can be done now can be done under this bill. This bill does not broaden or weaken or lessen the authority. It merely substitutes a local agency as the construction agency in the place and stead of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. With that principle I am in hearty accord, because out in California we have a total of over 100 successful irrigation districts that never got a dime from the Federal Government. We can do the job ourselves if we can get a little help. There is a nice, wide range here. You go up to \$5 million before the project is considered outside the purview of the bill, as I understand it.

Mr. ENGLE. No. This would go as high as \$10 million for the total cost of the project, but the Government would never put up more than half of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for that comment as that makes the bill more palatable.

Mr. ENGLE. I would emphasize one other thing, that this requires a contribution on the part of the local district for engineering cost, designing, planning, plus all the land acquisition costs, which are considerable items in connection with these projects.

(Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, this proposal will be a tremendous help to those who wish to develop small irrigation and conservation projects. We have a project right in my own County of San Joaquin that could be greatly helped by this legislation. It is a conservation district that is trying to conserve the underground waters in the eastern part of our county.

Local control has many virtues. One is that it places the responsibility for the success of the project on the people that will pay for it and get the benefit of it. In the event of the necessity for modifications of the project that can be handled locally. When the Reclamation Bureau is in control any vital changes or modifications of the project must go to the district office in Sacramento, then to the office in Denver and finally to the Bureau of Reclamation in Washington. This is a long and tedious route and is very frustrating to the ones who may wish a change made in the project, which may seem and usually is very simple. Bureaucratic control is cumbersome and costly. The administrative costs in many Bureau of Reclamation projects runs over 25 percent. With local control that would be greatly decreased. I congratulate the chairman [Mr. ENGLE] on bringing out this sensible bill and shall do all I can to help him reduce it to law.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 75]

Abernethy	Flynt	Mason
Adair	Friedel	Miller, N. Y.
Allen, Calif.	Fulton	Mumma
Anfuso	Gamble	Nelson
Arends	Garmatz	O'Brien, N. Y.
Ashley	Granahan	Osmers
Barden	Green, Oreg.	Patman
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Patterson
Belcher, Okla.	Griffiths	Philbin
Bolton,	Gwinn	Pillion
Oliver P.	Halleck	Powell
Bonner	Harrison, Nebr.	Prouty
Bowler	Hays, Ohio	Radwan
Byrd	Hayworth	Reed, Ill.
Canfield	Heslton	Reed, N. Y.
Carnahan	Hess	Riley
Cederberg	Hillings	Rivers
Celler	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Chase	Hoffman, Mich.	Seely-Brown
Clark	Holtzman	Sheehan
Cole	Hope	Shelley
Colmer	Jackson	Shuford
Coudert	James	Siler
Cretella	Jenkins	Smith, Miss.
Curtis, Mo.	Jennings	Smith, Wis.
Davidson	Jonas	Spence
Delaney	Jones, Mo.	Taber
Derounian	Judd	Taylor
Dingell	Kearney	Teague, Tex.
Dodd	Kelley, Pa.	Wainwright
Dolliver, Iowa	Kilburn	Williams, N. J.
Donohue	King, Pa.	Williams, N. Y.
Dowdy	Knutson	Wilson, Calif.
Eberharter	Lanham	Winstead
Edmondson	Lesinski	Wolverton
Fjare	McConnell	Yates

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COOPER] having resumed the chair, Mr. PRESTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 5881, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 323 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes and after I have concluded I ask that the Chair recognize the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. YOUNG] to handle the bill on our side.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 5881 is a partnership bill. It provides for the promotion and construction of small reclamation projects on a partnership basis between the Federal Government and local governmental units. It permits State, local, and public agencies to plan, construct, and operate small reclamation projects and receive substantially the same benefits which the projects would receive if they were constructed as Federal reclamation projects. It is a program that has been in the planning stage for a number of years, and a program that has been before this Congress on several occasions. This bill is the perfection of all of the studies that heretofore have been made.

The purpose of this legislation is to encourage local participation in and the

providing for construction of small reclamation projects.

The legislation permits State and local public agencies to plan, construct, and operate small reclamation projects and to receive the same benefits and credits from Federal funds on a nonreimbursable basis, as though the project were constructed under the present reclamation laws.

Any organization desiring to avail itself of the benefits of this legislation would, under the provisions set out in the legislation, submit its project proposal to the Secretary of the Interior, including a report on the plan, estimated cost, and cost allocation, and the comments and views of the State in which the project is located. The organization would be required to show in its proposal that it already holds, or can acquire, the lands and rights to the use of water necessary for the construction and operation of the project. The organization would be required to finance the cost of these lands and water rights and such other costs as the Secretary determined to be proper.

The legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to proceed without further congressional action with negotiation for loans and grants on the projects which he finds feasible and which he considers constitute a reasonable risk. The Secretary would, however, be required to submit the proposals to the Committees of the Senate and House on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Specifically speaking, this legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate with water-users organizations or other public bodies organized under State law for the development of feasible small projects. The local agency receiving these funds following approval of the plans would construct, operate, and maintain the project subject to compliance with Federal rules and regulations applicable to these features of the project which supply national benefits.

The nonreimbursable features in the basin in which the project is located would be credited on the contract, and funds which are allocated for irrigation benefits on the project would be interest-free.

The need for this legislation has come about by the fact that in many instances the Bureau of Reclamation is not geared to the economical development of these small projects. In many instances these projects have been financed by the States, but most States are not equipped to finance all of these small projects, with the result that development has been materially retarded.

Another feature is that when the States finance these projects, the local districts are required to pay interest on the funds for irrigation, and no credit can be allowed for nonreimbursable benefits which are provided for in the larger projects.

Many areas will be benefited by this legislation. Some areas need financial assistance for construction of small storage and diversion dams for irrigation purposes only. Some need funds for tunneling and ditching. Others envision multiplepurpose projects but be-

lieve that their purpose can best be achieved through local control.

The local people would do the planning and pay for the planning through cooperation with the State and possibly the basin project benefits will be derived which could not otherwise be derived by the local unit.

I stated at the outset that this was a partnership bill. It provides more local autonomy in the development of badly needed and financially feasible projects. It is a move to permit the construction of many small projects which are being delayed because of the lack of local means of financing and which are not of enough magnitude to receive priority consideration by either the Bureau of Reclamation or by special legislation in Congress. It will provide many projects which the local people are not able to finance themselves, but which in the interests of the economy of this Nation should be constructed and can be constructed if this legislation passes this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the bill presently before you is a small projects bill which makes it possible for minor units to do their own planning and come to the Reclamation Bureau with their plans for review and proceed under their own power.

In the past it has been rather difficult for small irrigation projects to get any recognition in the Bureau of Reclamation which was set up to handle large projects. This bill provides for local participation and for the construction of these small projects. In other words, we have built up a large bureaucracy in Washington and they have neglected the small projects. This places the control back in the local communities. They do their own planning, they initiate it, they have to pay for the project, and it makes the engineering costs much less. I think that is the American and the democratic way to do it. It is true we put in some restrictions limiting the scope of small-projects groups, they must provide plans for review by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Before we had the quorum call—and the quorum call came about because there are some differences of opinion relative to how far and how wide this legislation should go—the fact was mentioned that we introduced similar legislation last year which came within 1 hour of passing over in the Senate. It passed this body but because of the parliamentary situation in the other body it failed to pass there. It was similar to this except it was limited to the 17 Western States in the 83d Congress. The bill introduced this year was limited to the 17 Western States. The bill that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Young] and the gentleman from California [Mr. Engle] introduced were also limited to the 17 Western States. Others introduced similar legislation. But somewhere along the line certain of the Eastern States, because of the great drought that was going on, came in and said: "Well, we would like to be in this, too." And I think rightly so. But I am not sure, as

a Member of Congress and having been on this committee for 13 years, that I want the Bureau of Reclamation getting out into other States. I think their activities should be confined to the 17 Western States. At the proper time I hope an amendment on page 1 will be offered striking out the 48 States and substituting the 17 Western reclamation States.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that personally I have no objection to the bill in spite of certain minor things that do not meet with my approval. If Mr. MILLER's amendment carries to take the 31 Eastern States out of the purview of this act and thus not make it applicable to the provisions of the reclamation laws which are very, very voluminous and intricate, I personally will be delighted to vote for this bill.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. May I ask the gentleman, Why restrict it to the 17 Western States? What is the object of doing that?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Reclamation law, let me say to the gentleman, has always applied to the 17 Western States. That is basic reclamation law. Under this bill we attempt to enlarge the scope of the Reclamation Bureau and take in the 31 other States. I would be opposed to the Jones amendment, may I say, because if we are going to have reclamation at all, if we are going to have irrigation, it should not be under two umbrellas. We ought to have one agency to do it. If we adopt the amendment I propose for the 17 Western States, the Jones amendment will be no longer necessary. But if we are going to have reclamation, if we are going to have irrigation, let us not set up Siamese twins to do the same thing. It ought to be done under 1 umbrella and under 1 individual.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentlemen in the West may be interested in the irrigation features of this proposed bill. We in the East may be interested in the development of a project for the conservation of our natural resource, water for domestic or industrial purposes, which is just as important to us in the East as reclamation is to you in the West.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct, and there is already basic legislation for that purpose, namely, the Water Facilities Act.

Mr. GAVIN. Can a community come to the Federal Government and secure a loan to develop community projects such as the gentleman seems to be in favor of? If a municipality wants to develop a water project back in a district because of periods of low water, or for the conservation of water for industrial and domestic uses, the municipality itself has to develop the financing program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Nebraska has correctly stated that the facilities which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] mentions, are already available under basic law through the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GAVIN. Does the gentleman mean to tell me a community in my district that wants to come to this Government and secure a loan for the development of a conservation project for water can secure a loan from the Federal Government?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. GAVIN. That is the gentleman's understanding, but I want to be specific.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for colloquy with any other Members.

Mr. GAVIN. We ought to be specific about this.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Nebraska for the bill he introduced and passed in the House last year. In Oklahoma for many, many months we have had a very severe drought with practically no rainfall. Then recently we had severe floods with something like 22 inches in 40 hours. Had the gentleman's bill been adopted by the Senate last year, and had the dams, irrigation, reclamation, and flood-control projects been built, would it not have assisted many communities in controlling the floods and providing water for irrigation?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think it would.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] that the 31 Eastern States should not come under the provisions of this bill, and there is a very good reason for that. The Department of the Interior, under the Bureau of Reclamation, has been handling all irrigation and reclamation problems for the 17 Western States under the Reclamation Act which was passed many, many years ago because there is so much public domain out there. Now, to put the 31 Eastern States under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior would be forcing that Department into unknown and uncharted fields. The 31 Eastern States have different problems, generally speaking, than the 17 Western States so far as reclamation is concerned. I must say, however, to my colleague that it would be equitable and fair that a bill of the same force and effect should be passed by the Congress for the 31 Eastern States and placed under the Department of Agriculture if this bill is passed for the 17 Western States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the work the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] has done on the bill, as well as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and the Members on this side of the aisle. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. YOUNG], have worked diligently on the program, and I commend it to my colleagues because it does permit small groups to do their own planning and control their own works and pay for it, and it puts the responsibility back on the local level instead of placing it down here in a big bureau that in the past has been neglecting them.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior have the \$100 million fund to draw from, would there not be local rivalry between the two agencies using that fund?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not think there would be, and I think we just better limit it to the 17 Western States.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Do I understand the gentleman is not in favor of the Jones amendment at all?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If we limit it to the 17 Western States, then the Jones amendment is not necessary.

Mr. COOLEY. Then, it means it would not be extended to the 31 Eastern States?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It means it will go to the 17 Western States.

Mr. COOLEY. Does that mean that the 31 Eastern States will go out of the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They would not be in the bill at all.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Did not the Secretary of the Interior recommend that this program be nationwide?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Well, he did not in the 83d Congress. There was some pressure being brought by the folks in the East to extend it, but in the 83d Congress, last year, it was not in that bill, and it was not in the bill introduced this year by a Member of Congress.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. In the present session he did recommend it should be nationwide?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe that is right.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. YOUNG], who has been very much interested in this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, this bill has taken a course which was not anticipated by any member of the committee. Since I have been a Member of this Congress, I have noticed with increasing alarm that many of the Representatives from the State east of the Mississippi have felt that reclamation was some sort of a boondoggle which was meant only for the western part of the United States.

Of course, the history of reclamation is well known. It goes back to 1902 when, under President Theodore Roosevelt, the reclamation law was passed to aid in the development of the arid West. Since that time, of course, the program has expanded rather considerably and great communities which have been developed in the arid West are living examples of the effectiveness of the planning and the scope of this particular program. Certainly it is a program which must be continued and which we in the West at least hope will be continued.

We have felt for some time that perhaps some of the criticism of the reclamation program arose because of the fact that the East also has water problems. Many of the Eastern States have areas in which there are water shortages. Not too long ago we read about water shortages in the great city of New York where faucets had to be tested each day to make sure that they did not drip water so that it was not wasted.

So I thought it very sound that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs provided that this revision of the program should apply not only to the 17 reclamation States but also to the entire country. It makes available those same facilities—that same plan under which the West has been developed for the benefit of the whole country. It makes possible the development of municipal water supplies, irrigation, and provides the attendant benefits which we have come to know in the West for the Eastern States. They are going to need this help in the near future if they do not need it now.

I am sorry, therefore, that this particular situation has developed as a jurisdictional argument, not over whether the job should be done but as to who will do the job. I hope that we will be able to resolve the argument; that this bill will pass in some form or other; that the Representatives from the Eastern States, if they do not want the bill, will offer the proper amendment at the proper time.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. May I ask, if the Eastern States are considered in this proposed legislation, would it be necessary that any impounding dams constructed would be restricted to straight irrigation, or could they be multiple-purpose dams that would serve the conservation of water for industry and domestic use?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that any project which is built under this bill will be just as broad as any project which can be built under the reclamation laws. He can have his

project a multiple-purpose project if the people who are designing the project want it that way. This will be controlled locally completely. So, if the people in the gentleman's district desire to have a project under this bill and want it as a multiple-purpose project, the Bureau of Reclamation or the Department of Agriculture, whichever one administers it or approves the plan, would approve the feasibility of it and then it could be a multiple-purpose project.

Mr. GAVIN. In order to be specific, if it were a straight conservation-of-water project, could it be considered under this legislation if irrigation were not tied in with it?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. No. It would then come under the provisions of the Flood Control Act.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the gentleman was on the point of saying that he had no opposition to the Miller amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have no opposition to the Miller amendment, even though I think that the Representatives of the 31 eastern States are making a mistake in not bringing this program into being to apply to the 31 eastern States. I cannot help but feel that it will fill a gap which now exists in the services which are available to the 31 eastern States.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman will agree that the bill before us makes the legal provisions and the procedures of the Federal reclamation laws applicable to the 31 eastern States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, in which these laws have never been previously operative? Is that not correct?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I judge the gentleman is reading that from the bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am reading from a document furnished to me by the Department of Agriculture, which is very much interested, of course, in this legislation. Is not my statement correct?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I can only say to the gentleman that if he read the statement from the bill I know it must be correct.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. YOUNG. This does not amend the reclamation laws, it merely supplements the reclamation laws. If the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is adopted, it will mean that the small-projects legislation will apply only in the 17 western reclamation States and the legislation will then have no effect in the 31 nonreclamation States.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is my understanding.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman referred to flood-control legislation. The flood-control legislation does not permit any municipality that wants to conserve its water to come to the Government and lay its plans before the Government, have them approved, and be able to secure a loan to go ahead and develop the project for the conservation of the water.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. Why should not the same principle apply in this bill? Irrigation is important for farm lands, but conservation of our water power for the domestic industries and organizations of the East is just as important. It is a contribution to the welfare of the Nation. I cannot see any reason why we in the East should not participate to some extent in a program of this kind for the conservation of our water.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I could not agree with the gentleman more. It is my understanding that the Water Facilities Act passed by the 83d Congress is available for those purposes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I would like to have the gentleman discuss the relationships between this proposed act and the Small Watersheds Act we passed in the 83d Congress as it applies to the Eastern States.

Mr. RHODES. I do not claim to be an expert on the Small Watersheds Act, but it is my understanding that that act is primarily for flood control and soil conservation. This particular act is for the use of water for municipal purposes and for irrigation, and the other purposes to which the laws for reclamation apply. In other words, it is my feeling, subject to correction by someone who may be better informed, that the two are not conflicting at all.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

(Mr. BUDGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to burden the House with extra comment as to the merits of this legislation, but I do want the Members to know that we in Idaho are in favor of this type of contractual relations with the Federal Government. In my district we have many small irrigation companies with an inadequate water supply. If this bill is adopted by the Congress, and I sincerely hope that it will be, many

farmers in my district will be able to initiate small projects for the improvement of their economic status. As I understand this bill, it will provide that local people will be able to provide help for themselves with a minimum of Federal help and Federal control.

Water is the single most important resource—with the exception of the land itself—in my district, and there is a shortage of it in many areas. It is quite likely that if this bill is enacted a way will be opened whereby many of the areas which are now short of water will be able to provide some self-help and much cheaper than if it were to be provided solely by the Federal Government. In many instances local engineering could provide the cost estimates and without the delay of Federal redtape the project could be reviewed and approved by the Federal agencies. I believe it would create a natural outlet for construction and land development.

It is my understanding that later in the proceedings the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] will offer an amendment to restrict the operations of the Bureau of Reclamation to the public-land States which have historically been served by the Bureau of Reclamation ever since the creation of the Bureau in 1902. It is my feeling that the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Alabama should be adopted, as I feel that the Bureau of Reclamation should continue in the area originally assigned to it and the area from which the word "reclamation" arises.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KRUEGER].

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Chairman, this small-projects bill, H. R. 5881, appears to me to have great possibilities. It makes possible the establishment of small irrigation projects without a lot of redtape. Most small projects, limited in area, will not involve a large construction burden. They have come about because a group of practical operators feel that they can stabilize their farming with irrigation. Through this bill they can get financial help and the experience of the Bureau of Reclamation without the cumbersome legislative procedure that is required now.

In my State the North Dakota State Water Commission has 25 such projects now under consideration. They range in size from 500 acres to one with 20,000. The average is about 5,400 acres. These are not big irrigation farms, but are in the western part of the State where they will supplement the dry-land grazing. The prospective operators are ready to go under the simplified procedure that this bill provides.

The estimates by the North Dakota State Water Commission show that these are all sound projects and the net annual increase in production will amount to one-fourth of the total cost—a good return for any project.

I submit the resolution of the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, and the list of projects in North Dakota for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas the passage by Congress of the Miller bill, H. R. 5301, known as the small-projects bill, will greatly facilitate and encourage the establishment in North Dakota,

and in other States where irrigation is needed to stabilize agricultural production in seasons of insufficient rainfall, particularly the production of livestock feed, small irrigation projects: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the State Water Conservation Commission, That Congress is urged to quickly approve the Miller bill, H. R. 5301, in order that the benefits to be derived from the establishment of small irrigation projects may soon be realized."

The foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted by the State Water Conservation Commission at its meeting in Bismarck, N. Dak., on the 11th day of January 1955.

NORMAN BRUNSDALE,
Governor of North Dakota.

Attest:

MILO W. HOISVEEN,
State Engineer and Secretary of the
State Water Conservation Commission.

Small projects

No.	Project name and county	Source of water supply	Water supply facilities	Preliminary estimated project cost	Number of irrigable acres	Crop return per acre		Increased crop return through irrigation
						Dry land	Irrigated	
1	Yellowstone pumping (McKenzie).....	Yellowstone River.....	Pumping from river.....	\$180,000	1,800	¹ \$15	² \$55	\$72,000
2	Cartwright (McKenzie).....	do.....	do.....	200,000	1,810	15	55	72,400
3	Sioux (McKenzie).....	do.....	do.....	50,000	500	15	55	20,000
4	Williston (Williams).....	Missouri River.....	do.....	1,100,000	9,100	15	50	318,500
5	Nesson Valley (Williams and Mountrail).....	do.....	do.....	570,000	6,000	15	55	240,000
6	Shell Creek (Williams and Mountrail).....	do.....	do.....	300,000	2,800	15	50	98,000
7	Hancock Flats (McLean).....	do.....	do.....	600,000	5,400	15	50	189,000
8	Oliver-Sanger (Oliver).....	do.....	do.....	750,000	6,880	15	55	275,200
9	Painted Woods (McLean).....	do.....	do.....	370,000	3,680	15	55	147,200
10	Manley (Oliver).....	do.....	do.....	225,000	2,160	15	55	86,400
11	Wogansport (Burleigh).....	do.....	do.....	250,000	2,400	15	55	96,000
12	Square Butte (Oliver).....	do.....	do.....	275,000	2,750	15	55	110,000
13	Burnt Creek (Burleigh).....	do.....	do.....	200,000	1,940	15	55	77,600
14	Bismarck (Burleigh).....	do.....	do.....	475,000	5,000	15	55	200,000
15	Little Heart (Morton).....	do.....	do.....	400,000	3,900	15	55	156,000
16	Glencoe-Stout (Emmons).....	do.....	do.....	230,000	2,100	13	50	77,700
17	Long Lake-Kyes (Emmons).....	do.....	do.....	250,000	2,100	14	50	75,600
18	Horsehead Flats (Emmons).....	do.....	do.....	1,000,000	9,710	15	50	339,850
19	Winona (Emmons).....	do.....	do.....	550,000	5,500	15	50	192,500
20	Fort Yates (Sioux).....	do.....	do.....	800,000	7,650	15	50	267,750
21	Little Missouri (Slope, Billings, and McKenzie).....	Little Missouri River.....	Pumping from reservoir.....	3,000,000	20,000	13	40	540,000
22	Knife River diversion (Mercer).....	Garrison Reservoir.....	do.....	1,800,000	13,500	14	50	486,000
23	Cannonball (Grant).....	Cannonball River.....	do.....	1,860,000	12,400	13	45	396,800
24	Bowman-Haley (Bowman, Adams).....	Grand River.....	do.....	750,000	5,000	12	40	140,000
25	Big Meadow (Williams).....	None.....	Reclaimed by pumping.....	112,000	2,810	10	40	84,300
Total.....				16,297,000	136,890	-----	-----	4,758,800

¹ Estimated crop return for project area, dry land.

² Estimated crop return for project area, irrigated.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, we in Wyoming are of the considered opinion that the bill before the House is possibly the most forward-looking and important legislation, as it affects our area, that has been introduced in Congress in some time. To us it gives life and true meaning to the statement of our President's principle for development of partnership between the States and the Federal Government, for the general good with a maximum of local control and participation. Our recent Wyoming Legislature sent a joint memorial specifically memorializing Congress to go forward with this type of legislation. We urge the passage of this bill, H. R. 5881.

The State of Wyoming has done and is doing without outside help what it can do by way of reclaiming 62½ million acres of sagebrush flats, mountains, valleys, and deserts. So far, the people of Wyoming on their own have succeeded in reclaiming about 1½ million acres. More than 80 percent of this reclamation of Wyoming's land has been accomplished by the people of Wyoming themselves, backed by the investment of private capital and performed with their own labor without a cent of assistance, and not very much encouragement, from Washington and the rest of the country. In other words, the people themselves, straining their own backs and their own resources, have dug thou-

sands of miles of canals and ditches, tunneled through mountains, built dams to create reservoirs to reclaim 1¼ million acres—nearly 2,000 square miles of land that had previously supported only a few jackrabbits and antelope.

In so doing, they have established the base of an agricultural economy, which, by providing winter feed for their stock, has permitted the beneficial use of countless millions of acres of unimproved rangeland, mostly not susceptible to irrigation, which otherwise would be practically useless.

Much of this has been accomplished in recent years. Let me give you an example. Mr. C. C. Feltner, of Pine-dale, Wyo., an enterprising engineer in our Green River watershed recently dug nearly 20 miles of canal to irrigate nearly 5,000 acres, or nearly 8 square miles, of rich land, covered with sagebrush. Before that he had constructed a neighboring project, reclaiming more than 7,000 acres, or more than 10 square miles, which is now blooming in prosperous farms. Another of his projects includes more than 5,000 acres. I mention this enterprising citizen because he stands today as a heartening symbol of private enterprise, continuing to develop Wyoming's potential wealth, employing private capital.

The same is true of individuals and groups of ranchers who see in the configuration of their lands the opportunity to build and store water here, to conduct it there by ditch, to convert dry land into irrigated pastures or rich hay

lands, to raise row crops, in general to improve their positions and wealth through their own effort.

I do not mean to minimize the part the Federal Government has played through the Bureau of Reclamation in reclaiming the remaining one-fifth of Wyoming's irrigated lands. Most of the projects which the Bureau has constructed in Wyoming have been of such magnitude that the people of Wyoming could never have financed them themselves. At least they could not as long as the Federal Government continues to claim nearly three-quarters of Wyoming's total mineral resources and milks so large a proportion of the proceeds therefrom into the Federal pail.

To go back to the Bureau's contribution over 50 years, whole prosperous towns have risen from the sagebrush, nurtured almost wholly by these federally financed and federally constructed projects. There are other large projects which we ourselves cannot hope to build which we hope the Bureau of Reclamation will build.

Within our State, we have done everything we think we can in the past few years to reclaim the land. We have created a Natural Resource Board and within the limitations of our financial structure are making funds available to them.

But lying between what we in Wyoming can do for ourselves, and the programs that can be justified as Federal reclamation projects, there is a wide gap existing today that can be satisfactor-

ily and effectively filled by projects called for in this measure now before the House. Cooperation between the Federal Government and the people of our State can accomplish what neither could do so well separately, to the advantage of both.

It is our considered opinion that this bill will bring about much-needed development in our area, which to a large measure is being neglected and stymied without such legislation. We find in our State the headwaters of many of our most important western streams, but we are primarily a State of small streams, and in our mountains is stored much of the snow pack, which can either be conserved for beneficial use or discharged as an element of destruction in the way of floods further downstream. Many of us believe that the most effective and economical flood control is to control this by a series of small projects.

It is our belief that these projects would have a very desirable effect as far as flood control is concerned, and still be usable as irrigation. We subscribe to the proposition that large dams constructed further downstream are incompatible, as far as flood control and irrigation are concerned. However, in our mountainous area, a reservoir that is constructed to accumulate the water will accumulate it for irrigation, regardless of whether it is a rapid runoff or a slow runoff and we think such a reservoir would have a substantial effect upon flood conditions at a minimum cost.

We believe further that the principles of the bill offer the greatest and most economical means of development of a major portion of our area, and, perhaps more important, a means of giving stability to our economy by removing fluctuations through supplemental water supply.

With regard to this important aspect I would like to call attention to our Wheatland area project. This project was commenced in May of 1883, completion was in 1886. There are some 60,000 acres in the project lying around the town of Wheatland which has developed into one of our important farming communities. Due to a series of decisions stemming from water litigation and other factors, this project is without an adequate water supply during drought periods. The suitability of the land and other factors have been definitely determined from long experience, yet the stability of this community is continually threatened. It is not, and never has been, a reclamation project. The bill before the House offers one of the few hopes to satisfy this situation and others of similar nature.

Again, I would like to say that we in Wyoming earnestly hope that this bill providing for small projects legislation will be favorably acted upon by the Congress. We believe that such action will redound to the great benefit of our area, and to the Nation as a whole, and all in a manner in keeping with our best traditions of American free enterprise and Government. It seems to me that it is good, sound legislation, within the keeping of any principles of government that I am sure we all adhere to.

I sincerely hope it will be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this brief time to place myself on record as being strongly in favor of this piece of legislation.

I happen to represent a coastal area in California which is isolated from the principal supply of water by a mountain range. We have done everything possible to solve our water problem for ourselves, to the extent of levying a tax rate for water conservation in excess of \$3 per hundred dollars of assessed valuation. This legislation will assist us to continue to solve our water problem for ourselves, and for that reason I would like to be recorded as strongly favoring it.

I now yield to my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I represent a district immediately south of the gentleman from California. We have the same problem. We have two reclamation projects in that district and we hope to have another one. There are many places where this bill would provide a necessary partnership arrangement, where projects are too small to justify a Bureau project as a whole. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I hope this bill will be passed.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was before the subcommittee and when it came before the committee many of the matters that have been discussed on the floor this afternoon were not taken into consideration. May I advise the committee that the reason why the bill was changed to incorporate the 48 States and 2 Territories was because of this statement in the report, a statement by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Fred G. Aandahl:

Both bills are limited to the 17 Western States. Our recommendation was for a program that, subject to congressional consideration as individual proposals came along, would be nationwide.

During the last moment of the discussion, an amendment was offered and was accepted. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] took exception to the proposed amendment and suggested there would be opposition upon the floor of the House when the bill was discussed. We understood that. The discussion that is taking place this afternoon is in line with what many members of the subcommittee expected. However, the committee having jurisdiction of this bill in the first place wrote up the bill as they thought it should be written, for the 17 Western States. As suggested before, the exclusion of the

nonreclamation States of the Nation brings before this body the necessity of reclamation programs in the East. Many Members from nonreclamation States have spoken to members of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation asking for the benefits that this bill would provide, chief among whom was the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. There is a specific place in the development of the West and in the further development of the East, where legislation of this kind can be of tremendous benefit. We all know, especially those of us in the West, how difficult it is to get the Bureau of Reclamation to consider or even to study, let alone begin construction of, a small project.

I have grown up with the West, as most of my colleagues understand. I happen to live in a community which has either the second or third major water right along the Colorado River. I have seen large projects develop, but the small projects which mean so much to the further development of the West cannot or will not be constructed under reclamation law as it now stands.

May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation is supplementary to the reclamation act as such; that it does not take the place of the reclamation law now in the statute books, but is supplementary thereto; and, only where the legislation now before us makes direct reference to the general reclamation law will the general reclamation law be followed; otherwise the bill now being discussed will be followed. Because of the paramount authority of the legislation now being considered, the Secretary of Agriculture if this committee so desires, can be given jurisdiction over the 31 nonreclamation States and the two Territories, and the job can be done in conformity with the provisions of the bill.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I wonder what the gentleman means by reference to "small projects"?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman means any project costing up to \$5 million, generally. The bill provides, however, that if the local people see fit to assume responsibility for a donation of \$5 million the project then can go up to \$10 million.

Mr. FENTON. The gentleman does not mean to say that the Reclamation Bureau limits their projects to matters over \$5 million or \$10 million.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Colorado is stating that, as far as the practical application of the work of the Bureau of Reclamation is concerned, large projects take precedence and the small projects, as such, are not usually considered.

Mr. FENTON. If I recall correctly there are many projects in the Reclamation Bureau that are less than \$5 million.

Mr. ASPINALL. There are a few, but there have been none authorized for many many years, as I remember. Can the gentleman name one?

Mr. FENTON. Not offhand, of course; but having served on the Appropriations

Subcommittee on the Interior Department for several years I am sure there were some projects that did not approximate \$10 million.

Mr. ASPINALL. Let the gentleman from Colorado inform the House to this effect: That, as he recollects, since 1939 there have been no small projects authorized, that it was in 1939 and afterward that the application of the Reclamation Act of 1939 took effect, and that since that time the large projects have universally taken precedence. Up to that time the projects were authorized, I may say to the gentleman, either by riders on appropriation bills or by general application of flood-control measures.

Mr. FENTON. With the matter of feasibility determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In the matter of small projects does this mean that money will be available for the development of say, 40 or 80 acres of land under the terms of this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. I would not think so. A project under this bill must be a project that is economically and physically feasible; one which is presented to the Secretary, having jurisdiction, who finds it has those two attributes and finds that the method of construction and repayment conform to the provisions of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Then what makes this a so-called small reclamation projects bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. It is tied generally to projects that do not cost over \$5 million.

Mr. GROSS. One further question, supposing 31 States are excluded by amendment this afternoon on the floor of the House, will that reduce the \$100 million authorization in this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. It will not reduce it; it is not my desire to reduce it, I may say to my colleague. The \$100 million was placed in this bill to make it necessary to bring the program back to Congress for study and review and to see whether or not it was a program that was turning out to be beneficial. No change was made after the inclusion of the 31 nonreclamation States as regards this sum of money.

Mr. GROSS. If the 31 States are taken out, certainly it should eliminate need for some of this money; is that not correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. If the 31 nonreclamation States are allowed to remain in this bill maybe we had better boost the amount to \$250 million or thereabouts.

Mr. GROSS. But in the judgment of the committee with the 31 States included, \$100 million apparently was sufficient.

Mr. ASPINALL. I have suggested that the amendment was offered in the final moments of the consideration of the bill and the appropriation was not changed. The appropriation of \$100 million was in the original bill offered

in the 83d Congress and remains in this bill, even after the inclusion of the amendment to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to commend the gentleman from Colorado for his splendid statement and also for the work he has done in connection with this bill. I am sure that he is making clear to the House that there is no conflict between this bill and what is known as the general reclamation program which deals with the larger projects, as the gentleman pointed out.

Mr. ASPINALL. None whatsoever. This bill is supplementary to the general reclamation law.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman a while ago stated that it might be well, in view of the fact that the 48 States are included, to increase the amount of authorization. Would it also be well to have the authorization made in 2 separate bills, 1 under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior and 1 under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. I am considerably worried about the rivalry and fight over jurisdiction that may occur between the two Departments when the fund begins to run low and the applications are on hand in both Departments.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Colorado does not wish to take a position at this time upon that situation. As far as I am concerned, I would like to have seen two bills, one coming out of the Committee on Agriculture and the other from this committee. It appears there is not likely to be a bill from the Committee on Agriculture, so our committee accepted the responsibility of bringing the dual bill before the House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I may say to the gentleman that in my opinion that would be the ideal way to handle it, to have two separate jurisdictions, because they are accustomed to working with the Department of Agriculture and they are accustomed to working with the Department of the Interior. There should be two bills.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I advise my colleagues that this is a program in which the National Reclamation Association has been interested for many, many years. They were the ones who appointed a subcommittee of their organization to study the need and the possibilities. What is before the committee this afternoon, with the exception of the nonreclamation States provisions of the program, is the outgrowth of the fine, constructive work of the National Reclamation Association.

Mr. Chairman, for many long years people living in every river basin of the West have been looking forward to the enactment of legislation by the Congress which would authorize a small project reclamation program. Concerted efforts

toward these objectives date back to the adoption of the first resolution on small projects by the National Reclamation Association at its annual meeting in Omaha, Nebr., in 1946.

A few years later a special Small Projects Committee was appointed, made up of individuals with years of experience and training in this field. Chairman of this committee was John Bliss, State engineer of New Mexico.

These efforts have at last born fruit and we now have before the Congress a Small Projects bill which is strongly supported by the irrigation interests of the entire West.

There is a large area in the West where small reclamation projects are urgently needed but are not being built. This area, sometimes referred to as no-man's land, lies between the small water facility projects by the Department of Agriculture on the lower side and the more expensive and larger reclamation projects by the Bureau of Reclamation on the upper side. The area in between is sadly neglected.

Most of the small irrigated projects of the West were built by private capital. Many of these irrigation systems are in need of repair or they need a new or enlarged reservoir. Some of these provide the irrigation water for stock ranches adjacent to large areas of Federal grazing lands. They are important to the economy of the region. Rehabilitation of such projects as these would be of the primary objectives of the small-projects program.

In 1948 the Bureau of Reclamation made a survey of the potential projects that would fall within this category in each of the 17 Western States. A listing, or inventory, which was prepared showed that there were 439 such potential projects. Many of these would provide rehabilitation for existing irrigation works. These projects also would provide supplemental water to 607,000 acres of land now being irrigated with an inadequate water supply and at the same time would provide a full supply of water to 614,000 acres of land not now being farmed.

The legislation now pending before the Congress would provide a means whereby local public agencies, as well as the States, could plan, construct, and operate small reclamation projects primarily for irrigation. The determination of reimbursables and nonreimbursables as well as the provisions pertaining to repayment would be practically the same as provided for in the Federal reclamation law.

The outstanding feature of this bill is that the Secretary would be authorized to make loans to local organizations covering the reimbursable costs, thereby permitting construction by the local agencies. This would result in a tremendous saving in cost. Loans covering costs allocated to the irrigation features of a project would be interest free to family-size farms—160 acres. The Secretary is also authorized to make grants for those costs which would be nonreimbursable under Federal reclamation laws. The total cost of a project cannot exceed \$5 million.

One of the primary objectives throughout on the part of those interested in this legislation has been to simplify procedure and to cut out all red-tape except that which is necessary to protect the Federal investment, thereby reducing the cost of the project. This legislation goes a long way toward accomplishing that objective.

Small-projects legislation, such as this bill now before the Congress, has more widespread interest and universal support among reclamation-minded people of the West than any other legislation that has been before the Congress for many years. It will fill a gap where it is urgently needed. It would make the benefits of reclamation available to people living in small communities and sparsely settled areas, many of them far removed from the main thoroughfares where reclamation is not practicable under existing Federal reclamation law. It is based upon policies which have the strong support of both major political parties—policies which have long been endorsed by such organizations as the National Reclamation Association. It would make possible greater participation by the people most vitally affected—those living within the area where the project is to be constructed. It would truly bring reclamation down to the grassroots.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, this is meritorious legislation and I am in full accord with the provisions of H. R. 5881.

I congratulate the committee on its splendid presentation of the need for developing of small water projects.

The need for this legislation is so well stated in the committee report that I wish to quote it:

There has long existed a need for legislation establishing a simplified planning, review, and authorization procedure for small reclamation projects. Also, it has long been recognized that more active participation by local interests in the development of their land and water resources would be desirable. This legislation would meet the need for small projects legislation and would also encourage more active participation by local water users' organizations.

The President, in his fiscal year 1956 budget message, stated: "To the greatest extent possible, the responsibility for resource development and its cost should be borne by those who receive the benefits. In many instances private interests or State and local governments can best carry on the needed programs." It is the conclusion of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that the construction and operation of small irrigation and reclamation projects is a phase of the reclamation program which, in many instances, can be assumed by local agencies to the benefit of both those agencies and the Federal Government.

The program which this legislation would authorize fills a gap between the normal Federal reclamation project and the small local developments under the Water Facilities Act administered by the Department of Agriculture. The small projects which would be developed under this legislation, for the most part, do not have the weight to pull their way through the long procedure required for specific authorization by the Congress, nor do they have the ability to go ahead on their own. Consequently, in most instances, there just is no development.

The simplified review and authorization procedure set out in this legislation should result in reduction in overhead and administrative costs. These small projects are, for the most part, simple in design and construction and it appears that local organizations, by making use of local specialized knowledge, could design and construct them more economically than could the Federal Government.

The administration favors this legislation, as indicated by the report of the Department of the Interior included herein. This legislation has the enthusiastic support of irrigation districts and other water users' organizations throughout the country and of many State and national organizations interested in water resource development. Testimony was given to the committee to the effect that there are in the planning stage a great number of small projects throughout the Nation which could be developed under this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the preservation and protection of our topsoil is a serious problem facing this country. The effect of the destruction of topsoil means less food supplies and a farm population that lives near, if not entirely, in subnormal standards of living.

Nothing damages land more completely than floods. Flood control is essential. This legislation paves the way for small flood-control projects for farming community areas.

Under this legislation local communities, including small cities or towns may cooperate with their Federal Government in planning, and developing these projects.

I support this bill and hope it passes.

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of this measure this afternoon for several reasons. First, I believe it is one of the most meritorious bills that has been reported out by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Secondly, coming from the State of Nevada, we have a special relationship to the reclamation law. The father of that law was Senator Newlands, who formerly served in the lower House for 5 terms and then very ably served his State and country in the upper House. In Reno there is a monument to his memory, and on the shaft of that monument there is a statement to the effect that the wilderness shall break forth in waters and the desert shall break forth in streams and the desert shall rejoice and bloom as a rose. It is a fine tribute to a great statesman, but I believe a far greater tribute are the some 79 reclamation projects constructed since that time. We are proud in Nevada to have the first reclamation project, the Newlands project, which is located near Fallon, a flourishing community in west central Nevada. I am pleased to report that it is now nearing the time when it is completing its repayment. Another is the Boulder Canyon project which contains Hoover Dam. This is a remarkable project from many standpoints, both engineering and financial. Each month it returns to the Federal Government some \$800,000. In 1987, when the final payment of \$260-million-odd is completed,

it will not only have paid back the principal but some \$130 million in interest, and then it will undertake something quite unusual these days—to pay off some \$25 million in flood-control benefits.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman will admit, I assume, that Hoover Dam is half in the State of Arizona.

Mr. YOUNG. It certainly is.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not believe, may I say to the gentleman, that any person in this House objects to what the gentleman from Nevada has just stated, and that is the value of reclamation projects. My objection as expressed here today, as the gentleman well knows, is to bring into the Eastern 31 States the voluminous reclamation laws which are not in vogue today. I see no reason why, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and another gentleman here today have suggested, we could not bring legislation of this nature in before the House in 2 separate bills, 1 applicable to those States having reclamation laws today and the other to the 31 States so as to take care of the problems such as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] has in his bill. To me it seems like utter duplication to put the Department of the Interior in the Eastern States region whatsoever when today the Department of Agriculture must do the job relative to the Andersen-Hope watershed protection program. I want the gentleman to know that I certainly have no objection to this bill if we can get the 31 States out of it and put them into a separate measure.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the gentleman. I am sure the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be most sympathetic to the suggestion the gentleman mentioned if later recommended so as to take care of the 31 non-reclamation States.

Mr. Chairman, I think there are three important reasons why this legislation should be adopted. First, there has been a gap in our reclamation program. Small projects have simply not been able to get attention here in Washington. They lack the legislative voice to be heard, and if they could be heard, they lack the political muscle to secure approval before the committee. They lack glamorous names such as Fryingpan-Arkansas or Hells Canyon; they do not have dinosaur bones or national parks anywhere near to stir up public opinion. They simply are not able to be heard here before the House. Many meritorious projects therefore go unrecognized and languish because of the lack of congressional approval. This bill sets up a simplified method for planning, authorization, and review.

Secondly, I think it is a splendid bill because it encourages local initiative and responsibility. As the President stated in his 1956 budget message, to the greatest extent possible the development of

our resources should be borne by those who receive the benefits, and private interests, State and local agencies, can most times best do this job.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to compliment the gentleman on the fine statement that he has made in behalf of this bill and also on the fine and very effective work which he had done in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on this and other legislation.

I ask the gentleman if he would agree with me that one of the pressing problems which faces this Nation today is the formation of a water policy to provide guidance for the development of the water resources of the Nation. We now have three separate agencies in the Federal Government—the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Reclamation, all of which deal with water matters. Certainly I think the gentleman would agree that as a matter of economy and as a matter of good administrative practice some time in the future this Congress should take cognizance of that fact and formulate a water policy, and set up one commission or one authority to handle water matters within the United States.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the gentleman's point is well taken. With water rapidly becoming our most valuable resource in the United States, it is important that we have a sound program and a sound policy.

Mr. Chairman, the third reason why I believe this proposed legislation is desirable is that it makes possible a more economical development of these small projects. To request the Bureau of Reclamation with its 11,000 or 12,000 employees to undertake the construction of a small project, is almost like using a power shovel to dig up a flower garden in your backyard. The overhead expense makes many of these projects non-feasible.

Therefore, for these reasons—first, it will enable the small projects to be heard and fill a gap which exists in our reclamation law; secondly, it will enable State and local participation; and thirdly, it will make possible the more economic development of our resources—I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, you have heard a number of Members talk with regard to this bill and why it was decided that its provisions extend to the 48 States. I can tell you that nobody has actually given the reason why this bill now extends to the 48 States. Last year, Congress passed the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act and inserted a third agency, the Department of Agriculture, into the water field, giving them jurisdiction in 48 States. Last year, when a similar bill to the bill we are now considering, was before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House, the Department of the Interior wanted it confined to the 17 west-

ern States. Now, since we have the third agency of Government handling water affairs, the Department of the Interior saw that there might be somebody cutting into their territory, so they are now very anxious to have their jurisdiction extended over the entire United States. So, with no thought whatsoever as to what laws are involved or the great difference in the philosophies of the States with regard to the manner in which they treat their water rights and resources, but on the basis of the fact that the Secretary of the Interior wrote two lines to our committee saying that this act should be broadened and extended throughout the United States, so that the Department of the Interior can now battle with the Department of Agriculture all over the United States, we now have this bill extending the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior to the 48 States.

Let us look at what we are doing. The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Young] says that this is to fill a gap. There is absolutely no need to fill a gap at all. The laws presently on the books are sufficient to take care of these projects. But there has grown up in the Bureau of Reclamation a group of people who are not satisfied with building small projects. They all have to build big projects. Therefore, they have decided to come in and ask for these small projects. There is not anything that this bill provides for that cannot be done, as far as small projects are concerned, that is not already in the law and has been in the law since 1902. Yet those who run the Bureau of Reclamation—and it does not make any difference what administration is in charge—come here and want to build only gigantic projects as memorials to themselves.

These small projects should be built. There is no one, I think, that knows the problems of the West that will argue that. Therefore, I am willing to go along, as I did last year, with this bill to extend the small-projects bill and ask for local cooperation in the 17 Western States. That is what I think this committee should do today, that is, provide that this bill be limited to the 17 Western States.

Some Members from the East say, "Why shouldn't we be entitled to some of the same rights and privileges?" You should be. I am not here arguing and saying that you should not be entitled to them. But you cannot write legislation on the floor of the House, nor can you write proper legislation by one line that is sent up here from the Department of the Interior, and that is just what you are attempting to do.

People in the eastern United States, where public lands are very few, have never heard tell of the 160-acre law. That is something that is completely foreign to them. Yet talk to most of the farmers here in the East, you talk to the farmers east of the Mississippi River, and ask them about the 160-acre law and they do not know what you are talking about. Yet this bill which you have before you states that the 160-acre law will apply to all the small projects, and they come along with a provision saying that

anything that is over 160 acres the farmers will pay interest on.

What the Committee on Agriculture should do, and I recommend it to them, is to see to it that the East is protected and that the water rights and water policy are established in the East. It is the duty of the Committee on Agriculture to bring to the floor of the House a bill which will enable the farmers of the East to get some benefit from the water resources.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It has been pointed out here today that the bill which was limited to the 17 States had the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and was in accordance with the program of the President, whereas this bill, including all the 48 States, does not have that approval. That might make some difference. I am rather inclined to agree with the gentleman that we should have two bills, one under strictly Department-of-Agriculture jurisdiction and one under strictly Interior-Department jurisdiction.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the gentleman. I supported that principle last year and would support it in this bill on the floor. I was the only one in our committee that spoke in opposition to this bill, not because I am opposed to the principle for which this bill stands, because I am in favor of it, but because I am against trying to extend the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior to the 48 States without having had a chance to examine very carefully just what it will mean with regard to interference with State laws.

The program which the Bureau of Reclamation has had is completely foreign to the eastern part of the United States. I urge this committee that they limit this bill to the 17 Western States for a very good reason. Some of the members wonder why the Western States get interest-free money. All you have to do is to go back and read what went into the discussions of the original reclamation law. There you will find that the income from public lands, which comes from the 17 Western States, went into the United States Treasury and, therefore, the money that was being lent to the farmers in the 17 Western States was actually their own money. For the first number of years, while that was in effect in the early days of the reclamation law, they were getting their own money back. That is no longer the case.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman might inform the committee as to the position that the Department of Agriculture took with respect to it being the administrative agency in the nonreclamation States, since he had some contact with the Department.

Mr. SAYLOR. The Department of Agriculture states that they are willing to assume the obligation in the eastern States. I was before the Committee on Rules when Mr. JONES, the gentleman

from Alabama, suggested that he handle this amendment. Mr. HOPE, the gentleman from Kansas, the ranking Republican member, was there and he stated that the Department of Agriculture was willing to assume the duties under this bill, but there were a number of questions which they had raised with regard to the application of eastern water law to this bill, as drafted.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. It is a fact, is it not that the Government is required to recognize local and State law with reference to these projects?

Mr. SAYLOR. In theory, that is what they are supposed to do, but the gentleman from California knows as well as I do that the Bureau of Reclamation is noted for the fact that they love to disregard the local State laws. He and I, and several other Members of the House on both sides, had a tremendous fight with the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Army, and certain other groups—the Department of the Navy and the Department of Defense, because they did not want to recognize State law with regard to water matters.

Mr. ENGLE. Our quarrel was not with the Bureau of Reclamation. Our quarrel was with the Department of Defense. It is stated here so far as we are concerned, that is some of us on this committee, if the eastern fellows want their portion of this program administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, it is perfectly all right with us and he would be required to comply with and abide by State law with reference to water rights and the acquisition of water.

Mr. SAYLOR. There is absolutely nothing in this bill which would require the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior or anyone else to comply with State law with regard to water rights.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman has pointed out that he believes this bill should apply only to the 17 western reclamation States. Yet, are we to interpret that you favor the Jones amendment which would take jurisdiction out of the Department of the Interior and place it in the hands of Agriculture if the Eastern States or the 31 nonreclamation States are to be included?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am going to offer an amendment to this bill to limit the jurisdiction of this bill to the 17 Western States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, if we adopt the Jones amendment, we would be establishing another department of irrigation in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, first I want to congratulate and applaud the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in bringing out, in my opinion, the most significant and most important water resources bill that has been considered by the Congress since I have been a Member.

It is a good job for more than one reason in that it helps agriculture and it insures by the wise use of this law in every section of the United States an acceleration of the prudent use of our water resources. There has been some discussion that this is incompatible with existing water legislation. It is a complement to the existing legislation that we have on the subject.

As I stated earlier, it is not inconsistent with the Flood Control Act of 1944, or the Watershed Act or the Water Facilities Act that we passed last year.

Let me bring one very important thing to your mind, if you do not already know it. When we passed the Watershed Act last year, we did not create a new law. The only thing we did was to take from the Flood Control Act of 1944 and 1936 the authority already vested in the Committee on Public Works and transfer it to the Committee on Agriculture, and limited the committee's authority to 5,000-acre-feet projects. That is the only change that was made in existing law in passing the Watershed bill that was passed last year. Of course it is a fine bill, because it provides that we will work with the farmers to practice soil conservation and to use crop rotations in such a way that it would reduce soil erosion and the loss of fertility of the soil.

It is suggested that this bill is all wrong; that if the Department of Agriculture is to administer the law outside of the reclamation States, it should go back to the Committee on Agriculture to bring in a new resolution and come back with the same bill we are presently considering.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. What you are actually doing if you adopt this bill is to extend it to the Eastern States so that you will have the farmers down there in your district who will find two identical acres of their farm under entirely different rules and regulations. On one acre they will get a loan on which they will pay no interest; and on the adjoining acre, which is growing the same crops, they will have to pay Uncle Sam 2½ percent interest.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Oh, I am ambitious enough to want my farmers to have more than 160 acres and more than 320 acres, but I will accept the willingness on the part of the Federal Government to assist in bringing into being

greater crop production on 160 acres of land. I am not alarmed or disturbed because there is a restriction of 160 acres of land.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that if his amendment is adopted it will be in conflict with section 4 of the bill, which puts it under the Federal reclamation law; also in conflict with the provisions on page 7, in section 5, instead of a reclamation project, the construction shall be the controlling feature. I think the gentleman should anticipate, if his amendment is adopted, that it will be in conflict with several sections of the bill.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am glad the gentleman brought this question up, because I was going to explain that I have several other amendments to reconcile the differences between the Bureau of Reclamation administration of the law and the Department of Agriculture.

It seems to me that we have 1 project, 1 problem, because we feel that water is just as important in Alabama, New York, Massachusetts, and Missouri as it is in the State of California. We have worked to procure the use of these water resources, to carry out flood-control projects, rivers and harbors projects, reclamation projects bringing in new land for new uses and increased production. This bill would apply universally in every section of the United States. We should follow the path that leads toward accomplishing irrigation for all sections of the United States.

I would like to say that there are multiple uses provided under this bill. The multiple uses are for industrial water use, if it can pay part of the financing of the plan; water for municipal use, all of these things can be brought together under this bill, and, therefore, the water that will be produced under these loans will repay benefits to the Federal Government in increased earnings and increased production of the farm people. It will be repaid many times in the wealth and growth of the country and comfort of its people.

Much progress has been made in conserving the soil and water resources of the Nation. But the job is far from finished. Our country is still using its soil resources at a rate faster than it is building them up.

The soil, water, and forest resources of the United States are the foundation blocks in the structure of the national economy. From that base come the food, clothing, fiber, and the various products that keep us going. How well these resources are protected and improved in the years ahead will have a direct bearing on the standard of living of every citizen in the entire land.

Despite temporary surpluses of some products, the demands upon agriculture will grow heavier in the immediate future. Our population—as we all know—is increasing by leaps and bounds.

By 1975 the Nation will likely need the production equivalent of an additional 115 million acres of improved cropland to keep pace with the demands of our growing population. Present estimates are that the United States will fall short of that requirement by as much as 70 million acres. There is not enough new land to fill that need. Most of our arable land is already under the plow. Some of it is eroded and worn away. Yet these same acres are all we have for future generations in this fast-growing land of ours.

To meet rising demands, the Nation's farmers will have to depend mainly upon increasing the per acre yield on cultivated land. In this connection there is one great potential that we have not yet generally embraced. That is irrigation.

Water is our most precious natural resource. It is the one indispensable element in the cultivation of foodstuffs. In all the history of agriculture, the oldest science practiced by man, no substitute for water has ever been found. We have in some sections of our country abundant rainfall, yet only 40 percent of the rainfall is converted to useful purposes. The rest flows unused into the ocean. Such prodigal waste no longer can be tolerated in the face of increasing demands for water by industry, agriculture, and municipalities.

Irrigation has largely been limited to the Western States, where it has transformed deserts into productive land. Every schoolboy knows what irrigation has meant in the development of States such as California and Arizona. Less than 3 percent of the tilled land in the United States today is irrigated. Yet it yields a fourth of the Nation's agricultural products.

There has been some expansion of irrigation in the Eastern States. Because most of the expansion in humid area irrigation has taken place since the last census, accurate figures indicating the total growth are not available. Individual surveys in several Eastern States, however, tell part of the story. For example, irrigated land in Virginia has increased over 400 percent in the last 4½ years. Data from Missouri indicate similar trends. Soil Conservation Service has assisted the farmers in 31 Eastern States to install over 5,900 sprinkler irrigation systems, and to build 3,200 reservoirs to store irrigation water. Almost 1 million acres of farmland have been properly irrigated as the result of this program.

Why are we so interested in irrigation in the South and East? In recent years, studies have been made by several States and agencies to determine the probable frequency of the occurrence of moisture-deficient periods. The results in all cases indicate that the humid East suffers soil-moisture deficiencies for frequent and extended periods. As a matter of fact, drought periods have occurred with far greater frequency in the South and East than is generally believed to be the case.

Mississippi studies of moisture data over a period of 22 years showed that soil-moisture deficiencies occurred each year. An exhaustive study of the 82-

year record at Memphis, Tenn., by the United States Weather Bureau shows 1 drought of 103 days' duration, 2 droughts more than 2 months in length, 5 droughts between 1 and 1½ and 2 months in length, 32 droughts between 1 and 1½ months in length, and 198 droughts between 14 days and 1 month in length. This is an average of 3 droughts for a cotton-growing season covering a total of 67 days for the season.

The very severe drought of the past 4 years has undoubtedly been a major factor in increasing our concern and interest in irrigation possibilities. Other contributing factors are the introduction of aluminum pipe which has reduced the labor problems in connection with irrigation projects and has provided equipment for a long life without rapid destruction by rust; the greater development of water resources through the construction of ponds and storage reservoirs; and the fact that the American consumer is demanding and is willing to pay for higher quality farm products, and irrigation is a necessity if top quality crops are to be produced each year.

During recent years the cost of conducting farming operations has increased so much that very few farmers can afford even one crop failure. Seeds, fertilizers, equipment, and labor must be fully utilized every year to stay on a paying basis. The farmer has a heavy capital investment in machinery. Farming is an expensive business and a farmer must be assured of water when he needs it. Through the proper use of irrigation, the drought hazard can be eliminated from farming operations and thus place agricultural production on a much more stable basis.

Research and investigations to improve irrigation practices have been carried on for about 50 years in the Western States. Out of these studies and experiences we have learned some basic principles of irrigation that will apply in the Eastern as well as in the Western States. We are finding out that having water when it is needed can mean increased production and it can mean elimination of drought damage of crops.

Experiments have been carried out demonstrating that irrigation can be successfully used on practically all crops grown on the farms of the United States. In certain areas some crops will pay better than others, but through careful selection of the method of applying water, and the amount of water applied, irrigation can be used on all crops that would be included in normal rotation.

In order to demand maximum prices, it is important that many crops be placed on the market at specified times. With the use of irrigation which gives prompt germination and maximum use of fertilizers, planting dates can be properly regulated, and the time of maturity will be closely controlled. This factor alone often means the difference between profit and loss in many highly competitive areas.

The efficient use of irrigation permits much better utilization of the land in accordance with its capabilities. Crops that permit erosion damage can be confined more nearly to the classes of land

on which erosion is less severe. Increased yields per acre can be obtained through high fertility and adequate moisture. Use of the more erodible land for grass and legume production therefore will be more feasible and practical. Irrigation will also help start new seedings, needed for a vegetative cover on eroded areas, grassed waterways, earth embankments, roadside cuts, and so forth. With irrigation, fertilizers can be made available for plant use immediately after they are applied if it is so desired.

Experiments have been carried on which show that supplementary irrigation in our rainfall belt—the Southeastern States—helps insure greater yields and adds greatly to the quality of the stuff we grow. In 1952, Alabama reported that irrigation increased seed cotton 1,018 pounds per acre and corn 53 bushels per acre. The 1952 irrigation studies at Athens, Ga., showed tomato yields were increased from 6,450 pounds per acre to 18,900 pounds per acre; seed cotton from 742 pounds per acre to 2,534 pounds per acre; 7 inches of irrigation water raised corn production from 34 to 98 bushels an acre; while 10 inches of water increased sweetpotato yields from 102 to 242 bushels. These are some examples of what we can expect from proper and wise irrigation practices.

Humid area irrigation, however, should be more than just a crop insurance used only to pour on some water during a dry spell and save a crop. It is important to realize that good irrigation farming is necessary for maximum production on a long-time basis.

For many years, the South has been leading the crusade for soil conservation and good land use. Now we must crusade for wise water conservation and wise water use as the very best means of conserving the soil. Actually, irrigation in our rainfall belt will be one of the final steps in a complete soil- and water-management program on the farm.

In the past 50 years, there have been two great revolutions in America's leading industry of agriculture—mechanization and irrigation. The South has long since adopted mechanical equipment and conveniences, but we are just beginning to wake up to the potential that we have in the use of supplemental irrigation. I believe the use of irrigation will make a veritable agricultural paradise of the South. It will, I believe, create new economic frontiers that will benefit the entire population.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I do want to point out that the Members from the 17 Western States are not divided on this bill. They want it for the 17 States. But under the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] the Secretary of Agriculture would be working on and under reclamation laws which he knows little about. They have no State authority to handle water matters and unless we offered many, many more amendments to the bill, the Secretary of Agriculture would be at a great

disadvantage in connection with the reclamation laws which apply only to the 17 Western States.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I think we ought to make something quite plain. The reclamation law as you look at it is a volume about an inch and a half thick. All the reclamation laws that apply to this legislation are written within the four corners of this bill, which is 10 pages long, and to the extent that the reclamation laws appear in this bill it is applicable to these projects, and not otherwise. This legislation does not incorporate by reference a volume an inch and a half thick containing the reclamation laws, with all the additions, amendments, and supplements since 1902. Such portion of the reclamation laws as apply to these projects is within the four corners of this bill. By reading it you can determine how much reclamation law is in it. There is nothing in here that makes this legislation incapable or unsusceptible of being operated by the Department of Agriculture just as easy in the Eastern States as by the Department of the Interior in the Western States. I think that should be made clear.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. May I ask the gentleman, Does not the amendment place the Secretary of Agriculture under reclamation law?

Mr. ENGLE. I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] place the Secretary of Agriculture under the reclamation law in this bill?

Mr. ENGLE. Only to the extent that this bill itself incorporates the law. For instance, the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred to the application of the 160-acre limitation with the proviso that areas in excess of 160 acres should be required to pay an amount which represented the interest on the capital investment in the excess areas.

There are 1 or 2 provisions like that where standards, for instance, with reference to the engineering projects as required under reclamation law are indicated, and only those, not the general reclamation law. There is nothing in it that an intelligent Secretary of Agriculture could not administer and there is no particular reason for supplementing or displacing these agricultural offices scattered all over the East and South. If the gentlemen in those areas want that administration I do not see why they should not have it. At least, I am not going to object to it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am pleased and happy to see gentlemen on that side of the House give so much praise to our Secretary of Agriculture. I have not heard quite so much praise of him from that side in a long time. The Secretary of Agriculture receives great praise from the Democratic side of the House for this, and I am inclined to think he would do a good job of it under the reclamation law. But this would

place him under the reclamation law. He knows nothing about the procedures under that law. The other 31 States have no water laws such as we have in the 17 western States setting up water rights and water programs.

Again, this amendment was placed in the bill in the last 5 minutes we were in committee and would rewrite entirely the reclamation law. I may say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], that we were not in agreement before the Rules Committee. But the 17 western States are in agreement on this bill. They need it and I hope that the easterners, if they want a bill, and I will help you get it, will come in here with separate legislation and not place amendments on this bill which will not be workable, with a \$100 million appropriation. They will be fighting over appropriations and no one will get anything.

So, I beg of you to keep to the original intent of this bill as we passed it in the 83d Congress and as introduced in this session by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], and myself. We did not consider the amendment putting the Secretary of Agriculture in this bill. I submit to you that is not the time to write major legislation, making a change which places the Secretary of Agriculture in the business of reclamation. I am sure reclamation ought to be under one umbrella. If the eastern section wants separate legislation, it should be given consideration by the proper committee. Let the 17 western States proceed under this bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I was wondering during this debate how long it was going to be before somebody got their hands called about this praise they have been pouring over a certain Secretary's head. Frankly, I do not care who I am under in this legislation. I am sorry, and I sincerely regret that the fuss started about who was going to be under which Secretary insofar as this legislation is concerned, and I think it would be a tragedy if this legislation, important as it is, should be defeated or measurably hurt by the question of who is going to get the right to administer it.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation was before this House and passed this House last year in a little different form, but it passed the House last year. I notice my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] grabbing the mike. It was in regard to the 17 Western States. Now, at that time we had hoped that it would go through the Senate, and, of course, if it passes this time, we hope it will go through the Senate and not die again. But, in any event, the legislation, in my opinion, is a must, and we should not try to scuttle it by trying to mix it up as to whether or not the Bureau of Reclamation is a good bureau of whether or not the Secretary of Agriculture is a good man. I do not care

who administers it so long as he is honest.

Now, we have got this legislation in pretty good shape right now. I think that we had quite a few fusses about it; We had some in committee last year, and we had some more in committee this year, and one of those things I want to talk to you about.

I noticed the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] said there was some talk about this filling a gap, and he wanted to know where the gap was. Well, now, there is a gap in this country that needs to be filled insofar as water projects are concerned, and this bill will do that job, and that is the reason I want to see the bill passed. Let us get this legislation on the move, get it through this House, and start it toward President Eisenhower so that he can sign it.

What I want to do is to point up the fact that this legislation is in complete conformity with the program announced by the President of the United States for a partnership between the local communities and the Federal Government. This legislation contains provisions that will enable many of the small communities in this country to build projects that otherwise they cannot build under any circumstances. Many of them have been unable to build projects. Some need them for irrigation; some need them for municipal water use. To me that is the most important, because I think there are many small cities that need domestic water. Now, they cannot finance those projects privately for the reason that they cannot pay the interest rate that they will have to pay in order to get that money. In addition to having to pay an interest rate if they finance those projects privately, they are further penalized—and do not forget this—they are penalized to this extent: They do not have any money given to them by the Federal Government as they would if they financed the project federally or let the United States Government pay for the project.

In other words, they get no free funds at all for flood control, recreation and those other nonreimbursables. Under this bill, these small communities can go out and finance a project privately; they can issue bonds, they can borrow money from whatever source. It enables them to go out, under our system of free enterprise and avail themselves of the money market. If they do that they are not penalized. They can go to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, whoever may have control of this, and say, "We have got this project financed, it is eligible, we have this much flood control which we would get as a gift if we borrowed the money from Uncle Sam. But we are borrowing it from our neighbors and we think we are entitled to this same grant." And under this proposed piece of legislation they can get it and they should be able to get it. To say that they would not be entitled to it, would be to condemn private enterprise by exacting a penalty for individual resourcefulness. This bill will enable the

smaller communities to build those projects.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you in conclusion that one of the greatest things that can be done for America is to make these smaller communities self-sufficient and keep these people spread out where they should be, near the land and not cluttering up these big cities and creating social problems.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am for the Engle bill, H. R. 5881, which seeks to bring many benefits in connection with the utilization of our water resources to all the States. This bill places the emphasis on the small projects. For a long time I have felt that we needed a comprehensive water law. This is a step in that direction.

I understand that a motion to recommend this bill will be made. It should not be recommitted. It should be passed. Perhaps the bill contains some imperfections, but it is basically good. It can be perfected in conference. After we have had a year or two of experience with the bill we can look at it again. As I understand it the bill will authorize the expenditure of \$100 million for these water projects. That will not go very far when applied to the water problems, and needs, of the 48 States. If the program works out well, when the money appropriated has been spent, we will have a chance to look at this entire law again. I hope the bill passes.

Throughout my service here I have been intensely interested in our water resources and legislation to develop them. The Small Watershed's Act was a significant step in the right direction. As a cosponsor of the Water Facilities Act amendments which we passed last year, I feel that passage of the bill before us will be another fine contribution toward the eventual development and proper use of all our water resources.

The Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which I represent here, is fortunate in having an average annual rainfall of 52 inches. It is fortunate in having a large number of streams. The development of those streams for the use and benefit of the people of the district is of the greatest importance. The small watersheds-improvement law, to which I have referred, will aid greatly in developing streams where there is a flood-control problem. The amendments to the Water Facilities Act of last year are aiding greatly where irrigation is desirable. Now, this bill, as I see it, will fit those situations where small multiple-purpose projects would be advantageous. It should pass.

I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] for the successful fight he has waged here today to get the Engle bill amended so that its administration insofar as projects located in the 31 Eastern States of the country are concerned will be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture. His position was sound. It was in the interest of good administration. It was the most economical approach. The gentleman from Alabama during his service in the Congress has become a great expert in the field of legislation pertaining to water and its use.

I urge the defeat of the motion to recommit this bill, and then the passage of the bill by an overwhelming vote.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN moves that the the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 7, noes 56.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that does not bring on an automatic roll call. The Chair will count to determine whether a quorum is present. [After counting.] One hundred and eleven Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the purpose of this act is to encourage State and local participation in the development of projects under the Federal reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in the development of similar projects in all 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska by non-Federal organizations.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 1, line 6, strike out "all 48 States" and insert "the 17 western reclamation States."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I might say to the committee that I am sure if this amendment were accepted we could have this bill through the House in about 10 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to have this bill conform to the one which was passed by the House last year, to make it conform to the recommendation we received from the Interior Department and the Bureau of the Budget. As has been called to the committee's attention, this bill has not been approved by either the Department of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. May I suggest that if we could take all the water I have down in my coal mines in Pennsylvania and put it out in the Western States it would solve everybody's problem here.

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be delighted if the gentleman will just turn it over to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Dawson]. He will be only too happy to take care of it. There is only one thing, he will want you to pay to transport it to Utah.

Mr. FLOOD. I know the gentleman is for that.

Mr. SAYLOR. The amendment I have offered is very simple. This bill is a good bill if confined to the 17 Western States where the Bureau of Reclamation now has jurisdiction. I disagree violently with the distinguished Chairman of this Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], who says the only place the reclamation law will be tied in is within the four corners of this bill. He has not read very carefully the bill which now bears his name because this bill will incorporate every one of the reclamation laws that are written in the books; not those that affect particular projects, no; but the general reclamation law of 1902 and the reclamation law of 1939 are in this bill. If this amendment is defeated, and the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] is adopted, the bill will then require the Secretary of Agriculture to be bound by the reclamation laws. That would be poor legislation. This is a fight between two departments downtown. I urge favorable consideration of the amendment I have offered.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. To what particular parts of the reclamation law does the gentleman object in the application to the Eastern States?

Mr. SAYLOR. I have only 5 minutes. It would take me more time than the Members of this Committee desire to hear me state them, but I will be glad to discuss it with the gentleman at another time.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I will put it in the singular. Give me one objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. The Bureau of Reclamation, period. Anybody that has had any dealing with them certainly does not want to have their jurisdiction extended to the eastern part of the United States.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the statement just made by the gentleman who preceded me here points to a rather singular fact. It seems that in the minds of a lot of people in the last few years the Bureau of Reclamation has perhaps gained a reputation which is not exactly enviable. I am not here to defend the Bureau and I am certainly not here to condemn the Bureau. I merely want to say that when the Congress of the United States is considering legislation we must consider that the legislation will be administered the way it is written. We must not say that because a bureau has administered laws badly in the past, in the opinion of somebody, it will necessarily administer laws badly in the future.

If the only objection the gentleman has to the application of the reclamation

laws to the Eastern States is that the Bureau of Reclamation will administer them, then certainly he has made the best case I know for the defeat of the amendment he has offered and the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], which will provide that the law as it will pass the Congress will be administered by the Department of Agriculture instead of by Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. FNGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. FNGLE. The other section of the bill will be administered by the Department of the Interior and not necessarily the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau of Reclamation is the construction agency on reclamation projects. What this does, as has been said, is to set up a system whereby these small districts with these small projects, instead of asking the Bureau of Reclamation to come in and build the projects, asks the Secretary of the Interior on plans and specifications furnished by them and engineering supplied to grant them a loan to proceed to build it themselves on the same kind of repayment contract that they would sign if the Interior Department itself built it. It is not necessarily a matter of the Bureau of Reclamation doing it. The Interior Department will do it. As I said previously, I cannot see any reason why on a bill as simple and as plain as this, there should be any such question. If the Secretary of Agriculture can read, he can administer this one.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I agree with the chairman of the committee completely. I would like to point out further that participation in this bill is certainly voluntary. If any locality or any irrigation district or any State does not desire to come in to get money under this particular bill, then certainly no part would apply to that particular entity. So it is not a bugaboo which we have here. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] indicated that he had some fear that because this bill provided that the Federal reclamation laws would apply to all projects, that they might supersede the internal laws of the States insofar as the division of water and water rights is concerned. Of course, that is not the situation. The reclamation laws in the 17 Western States are subordinate to the laws of the State insofar as the division of water and water rights is concerned. The application of laws would be identical in the Eastern States. Any Member of Congress, I am sure, can be very certain that no law of this Congress is going to supersede the internal law of the State when to do so would be as unconstitutional as this particular application would be.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. A point which has not been mentioned here, and which I think should be emphasized, particularly by those of us who come from the 17 reclamation States, is that 52½ percent of the revenue which comes from

gas and oil leases in the 17 reclamation States, which is a considerable sum in our area, now goes into the reclamation fund. As I understand it, if this is spread over all the States of the Union, the other States will participate in that money which comes from our States out there. That does not mean that I am against the Jones amendment or I am in favor of the Saylor amendment, but I would say those of us who are out there feel that if others do not want to exercise that privilege, that is, those who are not in the 17 reclamation States, I think we should go along with them, because whatever is good for us is certainly good for the rest of the country.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in conclusion that the West has found reclamation to be a very good thing. We, from the West, recognize that we do not live in the only section of the country which has water problems. This particular bill was written with the thought that the benefits which we have enjoyed and which have helped us to conserve our water should be passed on to the other States of the Union. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I have a great deal of respect for my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and I certainly have a great deal of respect for his knowledge of reclamation law, but it seems to me that some of us are certainly trying to build up a bugaboo as far as the Bureau of Reclamation is concerned, to scare some people without their knowing what they are frightened about.

The whole point of this particular bill, as I understand, was to make it simple and easy for a small group of people, either for reclamation or for domestic water use, to secure some help from the Federal Government; to get some money to build that particular project.

This bill does not propose, even for the 48 States, to build up some great bureaucracy in the 31 States outside of the 17 Western States. The thing that is important is the fact that if there is someone in Alabama or Georgia or North Carolina, a small group of people who desire a project, they simply get together, determine the type and size of project they want, draw up the plans, and submit them to the Secretary of the Interior and he either approves or disapproves the project. It is just that simple. You do not have to create a big bureaucracy to administer this bill. You do not have to have a single office of the Bureau of Reclamation in your State or anywhere close to it. You do not have to go through any group of engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation. It is a simple matter. They determine the size of project they want. They draw up these plans and submit them to the Secretary of the Interior and he simply approves or disapproves of those plans. It does not seem to me that if there are those in the Eastern States who are interested in projects such as these—and I know there are, because many of us on the committee have been approached by peo-

ple in the Eastern States who are interested in these projects. I for one believe that if they are interested they should have an opportunity to take part and to enjoy the advantages of this money that is made available, just the same as those of us in the West.

I happen to be from 1 of the 17 Western States, and certainly I am for this project because I know what it will do for us. After all, if the East does not want a project and has no interest in it, does not want the money, that is a matter for them to determine. But certainly I feel it should be made available to them. It can be made available without creating some great bureaucracy or bugaboo of the Bureau of Reclamation aimed at frightening people in these 31 Eastern States. They simply submit their plans for approval and it will in no way tend to bring about a matter which will have to do with the application of Bureau of Reclamation law, necessarily, in any 1 of the 31 Eastern States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, let us review the situation as we find it at the present moment. The bill provides that the power and responsibility vested in the Secretary of the Interior under this bill shall be administered by him for the entire 48 States, Hawaii, and Alaska. If the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] were to prevail, it would mean that the only authority remaining would be for the Secretary of the Interior to administer the provisions of the bill in the 17 reclamation States.

It would cut out all the rest of the States.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I take it that the gentleman in discussing the amendment before us is opposed to limiting the provisions of this bill to the 17 States but desires to extend it to the entire 48, except that he contemplates amending the bill to limit the nonreclamation States to the administration of the Department of Agriculture; is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from New York is precisely correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In connection with the bill before us—and reference has been made to the reclamation law which goes back as far as 1902—will the gentleman's amendment amend the reclamation law from 1902 and all amendments thereto since that time insofar as the administration of the reclamation law in the nonreclamation States is concerned?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Let me say emphatically and positively to the gentleman from New York that the amendment I expect to offer will not touch side, edge, nor body, any provision of the reclamation law or any other law as far as amending it, superseding it, or bringing

into play anything that is not already before us in this bill.

Mr. OSTERTAG. One further question, if the gentleman will permit.

I am very sympathetic to the gentleman's amendment, but the thing that strikes me is whether or not the gentleman's amendment is workable in the light of the reclamation law from its inception.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I wish I could project myself into the future and appraise the wisdom of the Congress; and I would not want to speculate on the administrative agency because whereas it might be administered fairly and impartially it might also fall into unsympathetic hands; but that, of course, is a risk we always run.

The basis of this amendment is that what we need to do is go back and have additional hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, and when the Committee on Agriculture in its wisdom determined it was time to bring out a bill such as this to bring it back and we would be in complete accord on a bill coming from the Committee on Agriculture. Why would we want to go back to the Committee on Agriculture to get an identical bill to get the concurrence of those who are against it now? You know as I do that if they find fault with it now they would find fault with it should we bring it back here every day for the rest of this session?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I hardly think the gentleman's last statement is fair, because certainly I have no objection to taking the 31 States out. The objection I have, I may say to the gentleman from Alabama, is making the 31 States subservient—

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Would the gentleman object to Agriculture having a bill here including the 31 States?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Let me finish my statement, if you please.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Certainly.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. What I do object to is bringing the 31 Eastern States under the reclamation laws but under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture subsidiary to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No, no, no. The only thing the Department of Agriculture will be administering is this bill. Make no mistake about that. It is no attempt to administer any reclamation laws. As the gentleman from California said earlier, the only administrative authority the Department of Agriculture will acquire will be under the terms and conditions of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JONES of Alabama was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. There are two reasons for this amendment being rejected. First, why do we want to extend the operation of the Department of the Interior in these 31 Eastern States and have the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, establish offices

where the Department of Agriculture now has offices, where they have personnel who will receive the applications, evaluate them and pass them on to the Department. Secondly, the thing that is attempted to be done here, is to have one administration in the Department, Bureau of Reclamation, operating in the 17 States. They have knowledge of local conditions. In the nonreclamation States the Department of Agriculture is familiar and is intimate with the problems that they deal with constantly.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, this amendment takes out the 31 States. Will the gentleman support the bill if the Department of the Interior has jurisdiction over the 48 States?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes, I am going to support it. I am going to support it because I think it would be obligatory on my part to stay with the committee when I thought there had been unanimous agreement that the bill would be acceptable when it reached the floor. Had I known back yonder the differences that have come about within the last 24 hours, then I would not have relied on this bill. I went along with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and other Members that tried to work out an arrangement with the Department of Agriculture which I thought was satisfactory to all the dissident groups. Not until this afternoon did it come about that these enormous differences had to be reconciled in this debate.

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] that I expect to support the bill with the 48 States in, but I think it is much better if the Reclamation Bureau would confine itself to the 17 Western States. This amendment was offered because they rather felt, I presume, that the amendment putting the Secretary of Agriculture in the reclamation business would probably carry. I do not think that is satisfactory, however, because the Secretary capable as he is does not know reclamation law, he does not have the setup to handle all of the problems under reclamation law.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am going to be a little bit more generous with the gentleman from Nebraska than he is with the gentleman from Alabama. I am not only going to support the bill if this amendment prevails and my amendment fails to prevail, I am going to vote for it because I know there is a need in the 17 States for it and although I do not get the law extended to Alabama that is not going to frustrate me to the point that I am not going to look with a

sense of equity on the principles of the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman. The bill introduced in the 83d Congress did not include the 48 States, nor did the bill originally introduced. That was drawn up the last hour in our committee. The gentleman from Alabama never appeared before the committee to ask that the other States be put in or that the Secretary of Agriculture have any part in or anything to do with reclamation law. I think it is a mistake that he offers his amendment. I think he ought to let the bill go through and keep in the 48 States and not have 2 people handling the reclamation problems. If they want to bring in a bill covering the other States I will support it. The way this bill is written it certainly complicates the measure by bringing in the 31 States that are not under the reclamation law.

[Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. I expect to vote for H. R. 5881, and I sincerely hope that the committee will pass it by an overwhelming vote.

Many of us in certain parts of the country have been very much worried about the water supplies that we find are in ever-diminishing amounts. The gentlewoman from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH] introduced a bill which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture to try to help us solve this problem, especially as it concerns certain parts of the State of Georgia and my own State of Florida. I am hopeful that this legislation will correct some problems that we find in other areas of the States.

Now, our problem is simply this, that we find no existing legislation under which we can get any help or any benefits. I represent an area in Florida through which flows the beautiful Suwannee River. This river is not a flood-control problem. It does not cause heavy, excessive floods but about once every 10 or 15 years. There is not an economic justification for a district-engineer problem. There is not a possibility of any hydroelectric power. But the flow of the river during the past several years has been diminishing, and in certain parts of that river we find this last year that it has been completely dry. The source of the river is the beautiful Okefenokee Swamp in the district represented by the gentlewoman from Georgia, and because of the lack of water there the area has been ravaged by fire. We desperately need some way to help our farmers get some benefits of water. We want to fit in our problems with some general Federal program, and so far we have not been able to do it. I understand we cannot get help from the Water Facilities Act that was passed during the 83d Congress because the benefits of that act are limited to flood-control features.

Now, I want to say to the gentlemen of the committee who have brought us this bill that I am very grateful for what you have done. I would like to ask the chairman this question: Do you think, sir, that with the explanation I have made, that we in our area might be able to participate in a project if this bill passes? And what our problem is, of course, is to get irrigation, to get water from these streams that do not present flood-control problems.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman is exactly right. I did not follow all the gentleman said, because my attention was diverted for a moment, but from what he has told me, that is precisely what we are trying to do, and that is the reason, as I tried to explain to the gentleman from Minnesota earlier today, that this bill really supplements this watershed bill, because that is a flood-control program. This is for irrigation. The reason, for my part, why I would like to see the East participate in this is because I know that they are getting hurt from the lack of water and that this bill is the kind of a bill which will give the East better and greater water service than anything else we might do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman. I will vote against the Saylor amendment. I will vote for the Jones amendment. If the amendment fails, I will vote for the bill; because I want the 17 Western States to have the advantage of it, and then I will continue to work with the distinguished gentlewoman from Georgia to correct legislation in the Water Facilities Act if we are not successful through this particular legislation so our area may fit into this national pattern that I think is not only beneficial to our own section but to other sections of our country.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to take only a minute to say that I am not going to support this amendment, because I think that it is basically sound to include these 31 other States in the benefits of this program.

Certainly as a westerner, as one who has observed irrigation and reclamation and what it has done for our country, and knowing that it is getting drier and drier and drier, I cannot stand here and assert the benefits of this bill for myself and then turn around and say, "No; I will not do it for my eastern friends." That is not a fair attitude to take.

I do not agree at all that there is anything in this bill that could not be administered by the Department of Agriculture. When the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] offers his amendment, I intend to support it, because I think they should have the privilege of choosing the agency they want. There is nothing complicated or mysterious about it. This bill within its four corners has the applicable parts of the reclamation laws specifically referred to. There is nothing difficult in it. As I said before, any Secretary of Agriculture with normal intelligence could administer this law in the Department of Agriculture. There is no reason why it could not be done. It will provide the benefits for

these other people that they desperately need.

I am sorry that those who are interested in agriculture have gotten into a hassel among themselves about it. I would much prefer to see them settle their differences some place else rather than in connection with this proposed legislation. But because I think it is completely workable and because I think think it is fair to them, I intend to oppose this amendment and support the Jones amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that if this bill should become law as it is written, it would bring the rest of the United States, the 31 Eastern States, under the Reclamation Act?

Mr. ENGLE. No; it would not.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman think—

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman asked me a question, and I am going to answer it. If the gentleman wants to argue the point, that is another thing.

Mr. JENSEN. No, I should like to have the gentleman's explanation of it, because other members of his committee say that it will.

Mr. ENGLE. I am sorry to disagree, but we have taken this matter up with the legal experts in the Department of the Interior and we have gotten legal opinions on it. It does not. It is a supplement to the reclamation law. It is not an amendment of the reclamation law. The reclamation law applies only to the extent mentioned in the bill itself. The reclamation law generally does not apply. There are some 53 years of law covering reclamation, but only the parts specifically mentioned in the bill apply to these projects.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Certainly, under this act, they must come under certain sections of the reclamation law; not all of it, but under certain sections of the reclamation law.

Mr. ENGLE. I have not denied that, but what I have said is that the reclamation law which has been in existence since 1902 with its amendments and its supplements, is contained in a book an inch and a half thick. It has been implied around here that we have got a string in this bill. Someone says that this will take 53 years of reclamation law with it and makes that law and all of it applicable to the 31 eastern States. I say that it does no such thing; that only to the extent that the reclamation law itself is specifically referred to and made applicable within the four corners of this bill does it apply. And I say that any man who can read plain English can administer this bill. I think the Secretary of Agriculture, whatever his other faults may be, can read plainly enough to administer this law without any difficulty at all. As I say, I would just as soon have him administer it as far as these areas are concerned, because the Department of Agriculture is in those areas already. They have their offices

there. The people know them. They have confidence in them. So let them choose their own. For us, we take the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman admit that to a very great degree the climatic conditions and the soil conditions of the 17 Western States are quite different than in the 31 Eastern States?

Mr. ENGLE. I will admit there are some differences, sure, and there is a difference between Utah and the Central Valley of California.

Mr. JENSEN. Would it not be much better if we would pass a separate bill for the 31 Eastern States that might by necessity provide a little different law than is provided in this bill, instead of legislating here on the floor to bring the 31 Eastern States under a bill of this nature and bring them under the Interior Department or even the Department of Agriculture, with such a small amount of consideration as it appears this bill has had up to date?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Saylor amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is rather interesting to note from the debate that no hearings whatsoever were held on the so-called Jones amendment. It is frankly admitted that in the last few minutes of a committee session the Jones amendment was presented. No hearings whatsoever were held.

The gentleman from California, the chairman of the committee, says that the bill has nothing to do with reclamation and that if the Secretary of Agriculture is called upon to administer the act he can do it automatically. I refer to the first page of the bill, lines 3, 4, and 5, where we read the following:

That the purpose of this act is to encourage State and local participation in the development of projects under the Federal reclamation laws—

Mr. ENGLE. Go ahead and finish the sentence.

Mr. HOEVEN. I will read the rest of the sentence—

and to provide for Federal assistance in the development of similar projects in all 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska by non-Federal organizations.

Then on page 2, commencing with line 3, we find the following:

The term "Federal reclamation laws" shall mean the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

The Jones amendment would attempt to confer jurisdiction on the Secretary of Agriculture, and give him authority to administer reclamation laws. This would result in great confusion. If such jurisdiction is to be conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture hearings should be held by the legislative committee of the House of Representatives, to wit, the Committee on Agriculture. It should be first determined whether or not the law can be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture and, second, what the implications might be as to State laws. Furthermore we should determine whether the Secretary of Agriculture is willing and ready to accept such jurisdiction.

It might be well to take heed of the history of a similar bill which passed the House at the last session of Congress. It might be interesting to know why the bill did not pass the other body. I for one expect to vote for the Saylor amendment, and, if it is not adopted, I expect to vote against the bill, because we have here a serious jurisdictional question.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The substance of the Jones amendment was never before our legislative committee. That is something new that has cropped up. I think the gentleman is correct that new legislation ought to be brought in extending into the 31 States, and I will be glad to support it. Putting the Jones amendment into this bill will kill the bill. I hope he does not offer the amendment covering the Secretary of Agriculture, and that we go on a smaller basis.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR) there were—ayes 27, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "construction" shall include rehabilitation and betterment.

(b) The term "Federal reclamation laws" shall mean the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

(c) The term "organization" shall mean a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a conservancy district, irrigation district, water users' association, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar organization which has capacity to contract with the United States under the Federal reclamation laws.

(d) The term "project" shall mean (i) any complete irrigation undertaking or distinct unit of such an undertaking or a rehabilitation and betterment program for an existing irrigation project, authorized to be constructed pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws and (ii) any similar undertaking proposed to be constructed by an organization. The term "project" shall not include any such undertaking, unit, or program the cost of which exceeds \$5 million: *Provided*, That projects, the estimated cost of which is more than \$5 million but less than \$10 million, may qualify under this act if the applicant organization is ready, able, and willing to finance otherwise than by loan or grant under this act all costs in excess of the amount of the loan or grant which would be made under this act if the estimated construction cost were \$5 million: *And provided further*, That nothing contained in this definition shall preclude the making of a grant not in excess of \$5 million in accordance with the provisions of sections 4

and 5 of this act, to organizations which qualify for the same and which are not applicants for a loan under this act.

(e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of the Interior.

(f) The term "State" or "States" shall include the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the benefits provided in this act shall submit a proposal therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a payment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining the proposal.

SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project which has not theretofore been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail comparable to those included in preauthorization reports required for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been submitted for review by the State or States in which the project is located in like manner as provided in subsection (c), section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), except that the review may be limited to the State or States in which the project is located if the proposal is one for rehabilitation and betterment of an existing project only; and shall include a proposed allocation of capital costs to functions such that costs for facilities used for a single purpose shall be allocated to that purpose and costs for facilities used for more than one purpose shall be so allocated among the purposes served that each purpose will share equitably in the costs of such joint facilities.

(b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that the organization already holds or can acquire all lands and interests in land (except public and other lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water necessary for the successful construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this act such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have advised is proper in the circumstances.

(c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the governor of the State in which it is located (or an appropriate State agency designated by him) to be financially feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as provided in section 5; but no such contract shall be executed by the Secretary prior to 60 calendar days (which 60 days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain) from the date on which the project proposal has been submitted to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided*, That the said submission may, after the close of any session of the Congress, be made to the chairman and ranking minority member of the said committees and in that event, or in the event that the 60-day period aforesaid is broken by an adjournment of the Congress, the contract shall not be executed until the expiration of 60 calendar days from the date of such submission or from the date of its original submission to the committees as hereinbefore provided. The Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this act, may reserve from

use or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within his administrative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and which are required for use by the project. Any such reservation shall expire at the end of 2 years unless the repayment contract provided for in section 5 of this act shall have been executed.

(d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to financial feasibility, emergency, or urgent need for the project, whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irrigation water for an existing irrigation project, whether the proposal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irrigation or drainage. All project works and facilities constructed under this act, except such portions that are dedicated to flood control or other functions which would in the case of a Federal reclamation project be considered nonreimbursable, shall remain under the jurisdiction and control of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of the repayment contract.

SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this act shall set out, among other things—

(a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(b) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded the organization and the time and method of paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1) the sums lent to it in not more than 50 years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available; (2) interest, at the average rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, paid on the long-term interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on which the contract is executed, on that pro rata share of the loan which is attributable to furnishing irrigation benefits in each particular year to land held in private ownership by any one owner in excess of 160 irrigable acres; and (3) in the case of any project involving an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or commercial power produced as an element of the project and incidental to its full development, interest on the unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the loan at a rate as determined in (2) above;

(d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable functions is made, in accordance with regulations with respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal department or agency primarily concerned with those functions and, in the event of non-compliance with such regulations, for operation by the United States or for repayment to the United States of the amount of any such grant; and

(e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as aforesaid. The liability of the United States under any contract entered into pursuant to this act shall be contingent upon the availability of

appropriations to carry out the same, and every such contract shall so recite.

SEC. 6. Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project which has theretofore been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall be made in like manner as a proposal under section 4 of this act, but the Secretary may waive such requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of that section as he finds to be duplicative of, or rendered unnecessary or impossible by, action already taken by the United States. Upon approval of any such proposal by the Secretary he may negotiate and execute a contract which conforms, as nearly as may be, to the provisions of section 5 of this act.

SEC. 7. Upon request of an organization which has made or intends to make a proposal under this act, the head of any Federal department or agency may make available to the organization any existent engineering, economic, or hydrologic information and printed material that it may have and that will be useful in connection with the planning, design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the project concerned. The cost of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the cost of making and administering any loan under this act shall, to the extent that they would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 5 of this act unless they are otherwise paid for by the organization.

SEC. 8. The planning and construction of projects undertaken pursuant to this act shall be subject to all procedural requirements and other provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080).

SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100 million, to carry out the provisions of this act. All such appropriations shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under this act, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided.

SEC. 11. This act shall be a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 1, line 7, after "Alaska", insert "Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. If this bill is as good as some of the Members here have said it is, all I desire by this amendment is that it should apply to everyone who lives under the American flag.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have three amendments which I have sent to the Clerk's desk. The first amendment is the principal amendment and the last two are perfecting amendments, which would, of necessity, have to be offered if the first amendment is adopted. The last two amendments, in other words, are clarifying

amendments. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that they be considered en bloc.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we will have to have the amendments read first before we can decide on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the three amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Alabama: On page 3, line 8, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "with respect to projects located in the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, and the term 'Secretary' shall mean the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to projects located in any other State or in the Territory of Hawaii or of Alaska."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the Clerk omitted the name of the State of Texas. At least, in the amendment I have here, Texas is included. I wonder if it was inadvertently omitted in the reading of the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I will explain that when the other amendments are reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the other two amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 12, after the word "Senate", add "or if the proposal is for a project in a nonreclamation State or the Territory of Hawaii or of Alaska, to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Senate."

On page 6, line 4, add a new sentence after the sentence ending with the word "projects" reading as follows: "He may likewise, with the concurrence of the head of any other department or agency having administrative jurisdiction over and power to dispose of such lands and interests in lands, reserve them from use or disposition as aforesaid."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I must object. These are far-reaching amendments, and I want an opportunity to study them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] is recognized on the first amendment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been discussed. The hour is growing late, and I do not want to detain the House unduly.

This is what the amendment does: It provides that in nonreclamation States the power and authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior is given to the Secretary of Agriculture for the administration of the terms and conditions of this bill.

We have heard a great deal about economy. This is one of the great economy measures, since it provides that existing agencies will do the job. We do not create any new agencies for the 31 nonreclamation States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The bill provides for an authorization of \$100 million.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Under those circumstances, how is the \$100 million divided?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Well, like the division made on any appropriated item in a lump sum, the appropriation to be administered by any single agency.

Mr. GROSS. But you would have two agencies under your amendment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is right; two Secretaries.

Mr. GROSS. Two Secretaries?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Two Secretaries.

Mr. GROSS. Is it going to be divided on the basis of \$2 million per State, or how?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Well, I would think that the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture would get together and they would see that a uniform geographical distribution would be made in allotting these projects and making loans, to see that every State would get its proportionate share of the total.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman be adverse to an amendment to the bill which provided that \$100 million be divided equally between 48 States, since 48 States are included?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No; because there might be some States that would not come in and make application for a loan.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman think of any State that would not be in for a handout?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Oh, yes, I could. I am not the type of person who feels that everybody in this country is coming up here trying to get their hands into the Treasury. I have great faith and confidence in the people of this country, and I have faith that they will utilize this legislation to get greater strength and wealth and industry for our country. I do not share the apprehensions and fears that the gentleman from Iowa does.

Mr. GROSS. I have great faith and confidence, too, but it has become the accepted practice to come down to Washington whenever there is some money available.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am quite sure the gentleman, as well established as he is in his own party, will see that the Republican Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture will make wise and prudent use of this law.

Mr. GROSS. From what I have heard this afternoon, I think there are a great many people in this House who have more confidence in the Secretary of Agriculture than the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am glad to have your opinion about the Secretary. There are many more who are apprehensive about the way he is making disposition of surplus goods held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. But I am quite sure there will not be any insurmountable problems presented in the administration of the bill now under consideration by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many members of the committee have the idea that the amendment which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], just offered does what a number of people said the Jones amendment would do? Mr. JONES is confusing the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior over the 17 Western States, whereas jurisdiction over the other 31 States is given to the Secretary of Agriculture.

For some unknown reason the great State of Texas does not want to come under the provisions of this amendment and they have asked to be excluded. It is only the 16 Western States now. Where heretofore the people of Texas have declaimed that the present Secretary of Agriculture is a terrible individual, now they are going along with the Jones amendment, I understand, through the concurrence of the gentlemen from Texas, or some of them, and that they now want to be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture and not the Secretary of the Interior.

I have an amendment I shall offer to the Jones amendment and that will be to include the State of Texas, because the State of Texas is one of the 17 Western States. They have been under the Bureau of Reclamation, and I think they ought to stay there. They ought to stay right where they have been. If they want to defeat this bill it is all right with me, but let us keep them under the Bureau of Reclamation. That is where they have been all these years, and I am not in favor of letting them crawl out now.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. SISK. In this discussion as to what States come under the Secretary of Agriculture and what come under the Bureau of Reclamation and so on, as far as this particular bill is concerned I think certainly the amendment would have nothing to do with leaving any state under or taking it out from under the Bureau of Reclamation, would it, other than simply in the matter of the administration of these particular projects.

Mr. SAYLOR. Oh, no; it would have a great deal to do with them, because the administration of the act will be under one of the two Secretaries, either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture. If it is under the Secretary of Agriculture the Bureau of Reclamation will have nothing to do with it.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for one further question, for example, in the case of Texas I would understand from the gentleman's description that hereafter, providing this bill becomes law, with the proposed amendment, the so-called Jones amendment, then Texas, as a State, could no longer qualify for projects under the Bureau of Reclamation such as we have had in years gone by. Is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. I would not think they would not. Certainly they would not qualify under this act; they would have

to go to the Secretary of Agriculture if the Jones amendment is passed.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Would not a reasonable interpretation under the terms of this amendment be that Texas would come under the old reclamation law up to this point and anything from here on would be under the new law?

Mr. SAYLOR. I certainly think that would be a very fair interpretation.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, Texas would be under two laws.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. Am I correct in my understanding of this legislation as it now stands at least to this extent, the Secretary of the Interior will continue to administer the reclamation law as to the 17 public-land States, or 16 public-land States, and will decide what part of the \$100 million authorized in this bill goes to the 16 public-land States; whereas, on the other hand, the Secretary of Agriculture if the Jones amendment passes will administer the reclamation law insofar as it is applicable to the 31 other States.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. DONOVAN. And also decide what part of the \$100 million authorized in the law goes to those 31 States. Is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DONOVAN. What I want to know is who is going to referee the fights between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. SAYLOR. I do not know, but I guarantee it will be a good fight. Because you have \$100 million at stake, the fight that will result between any two secretaries of any two departments will be a real whing-ding. This is the best example I have ever seen the futility of trying to legislate on the floor on a bill such as this.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] was never considered by our committee. It should be fully considered by the Legislative Committee before it is acted upon. It is a very far-reaching amendment.

Mr. Chairman, further, it does place the Secretary of Agriculture under the purview of the reclamation law because section 11 of the act says that "This act shall be supplemental to the Federal reclamation law." The Secretary of Agriculture, good man that he is, and the Democratic Members have said he is a

good man, a good administrator, is not prepared to administer water and reclamation laws.

The 17 Western States would like to have this, of course, and I presume the Eastern States would like to have it also, but that ought to be by separate legislation considered by the Committee on Agriculture, properly considered in a legislative way, and not brought in here at the last minute as an amendment to a bill, an amendment which was never considered by the Legislative Committee.

The Jones amendment ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I hope that you will not allow the present efforts to confuse the committee prejudice you against the needs of the people of Texas. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] did not offer any amendment to make Texas throw its lot with the Western States. Most of the Representatives from our State feel we would be better served by being placed with the group where we have greater common interests. We do not have any public lands in Texas, as probably all of you know. We are not faced with the same problems that most of the Western States are faced with. We do have certain problems in common with them. For this reason we have been classed as one of the reclamation States. Reclamation has been carried on out in the El Paso Valley, in the extreme western part of the State, but the eastern part of the State is 800 miles away. It is far closer to the Atlantic seaboard than it is to the irrigated valleys of Utah or Oregon, and we have more of a common interest with the Old South. We feel that without the public lands that other States have it would be a mistake to put us in the same category with those States, for the development of small irrigation projects.

There is a basic and a sound reason for not including Texas with the Far West insofar as those small projects are concerned. I think the reason is sound; it is clear. It is the fact that we do not have public lands in Texas. We do not want to be simply used as a tool here to try to destroy an amendment that is a good amendment and that will serve a large part of the country. We feel that we are entitled to the same kind of treatment that the rest of the country receives, and that we should be put with that section of the country that will best serve our needs. That is all there is to the Jones amendment. It is an effort to see that that section of the country that does not need the type of reclamation that goes on in the West is given a slightly different type of reclamation. We believe that the largest part of our area in Texas falls with that group. We hope that this House will see fit to leave us associated with that type and under that control that we believe is best suited to our interest. There is nothing selfish about it. We do not gain a dollar, we do not take away anything from anybody. It is simply the recognition of the historical and the legal facts involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent (on request of Mr. COOLEY), the time allotted Mr. COOLEY was yielded to Mr. POAGE.)

Mr. POAGE. I appreciate the courtesy of my chairman.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman recognizes that the chairman of the committee has pointed out that this bill does not affect the old reclamation law. As to anybody operating under the old reclamation law, there is no change.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Then, Texas will be under the old law and also under the new law.

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right. For the larger projects, Texas will still be under the old law. Texas will be right where it is today in the present program, and this is as it should be, because that is the larger program of reclaiming deserts, which is applicable to the far western portion of our State. We would not destroy that program nor remove it. But, for this new program, the one that is provided under this bill, which is a matter largely of carrying on supplemental irrigation work on privately owned lands—and all of the land in Texas is privately owned—we feel that we definitely should be associated with the areas to the east rather than with the public land areas to the west, and we are simply asking you to do the logical and the reasonable thing, the thing that you are doing for the rest of this country, of giving each State and each area a degree of self-determination. In Texas we have the conditions which justified placing our State in the reclamation area years ago. We would continue that status. We also have conditions which justify placing our smaller irrigation work, the kind authorized by this bill, with the Eastern States.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. In the bill before us, this bill will make the legal provisions of the reclamation laws applicable to the 31 States.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. Unless you adopt the Jones amendment, the Department of the Interior would necessarily have to extend its personnel and offices all over the United States.

Mr. POAGE. That is right, which, of course, seems to be an unnecessary duplication.

Mr. COOLEY. If there is any conflict, it seems to me, if we adopt the Jones amendment, then the conferees should be able to draft a bill in conference which will avoid any conflict between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. POAGE. Certainly, the Jones amendment is not a perfect solution, but it does lay out a program that all sections of America can live under.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR to the amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Alabama: After the words "South Dakota", insert "Texas."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I think it is time for us to decide where Texas is. They are either a reclamation State or they are not a reclamation State. Now, since 1902 until 1955 they have been milking the cow along with the 16 other Western States. They have been saying, "It is a great thing." Now, when they come down to the stage where they see that they might have an opportunity to jump over where the Secretary of Agriculture has more money—

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I decline to yield.

I say, Mr. Chairman, the important thing that this committee has to decide is whether we are going out into Texas and do just what the chairman of the great Committee on Agriculture said he wanted to avoid, and that is setting up a duplication of offices, and unless you adopt the amendment I have offered, that is just what you are going to do. You are going to build up in the State of Texas a reclamation bureau already there. Now you are going to expand the duties of the Agricultural Department out there so that they, too, can handle reclamation in Texas. That is what Mr. COOLEY said he wanted to avoid, but that is what you are going to do unless you adopt this amendment and see that Texas belongs where Texas has been since 1902, and that is a reclamation State. I have not heard anybody from the State of Texas heretofore say they were closer to the Atlantic seaboard than anything else. The principal thing that the people of Texas are seeing is that there is more money being given to the Secretary of Agriculture, who has 31 States, than the Secretary of the Interior, who has only 16. The boys from Texas want to get on the side of the man who has the most money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take half a minute to comment on the statement made here that because these two agencies would be administering the bill in the 17 Western States and the other in 31 Eastern States it would somehow create an irreconcilable conflict. As a matter of fact, we all know that they are required to submit their budgets to the Bureau of the Budget. They are required each year to come up with the regular budget message through the President of the United States. That is normal procedure. There is no reason on earth why it could not be worked out without any difficulty at all between the agencies themselves or through the Bureau of the Budget as to how that money should be divided. As far as those in the West are concerned

we are not afraid that the Secretary of the Interior, notwithstanding the fact that he would have the small end of the stick so far as number of States is concerned, would take care of himself rather well on the distribution of the money.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that is no complication in this matter at all. I reiterate this bill is simple. It can be administered by any intelligent Secretary of Interior or Agriculture and I cannot think of any reason why the amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman means that he is in favor of the Jones amendment, then?

Mr. ENGLE. I propose to support it as I stated some time ago.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is it not a fact that the amount of \$100 million is just for the first year and that for the years following the Secretary of the Interior will come up with his request and the Secretary of Agriculture will come up with his request depending upon the number of projects they have in their respective departments?

Mr. ENGLE. I am sorry, the gentleman is not correct about that. The \$100 million is all there is in this bill and when that is used up we will have to come back and get another authorization. And the money is made available only through the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR) there were—ayes 33, noes 54.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 85, noes 23.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL:

On page 5, line 11, after the word "the", strike out "Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and Senate" and insert "both branches of the Congress."

And on line 15 of page 5, strike out the word "said" and after the word "committees" on line 15 of said page 5, insert the following: "to which the matter has been referred."

And in line 20 of said page 5, strike the word "committees" and insert "branches of the Congress."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been cleared by the chairman, by the ranking member on

the minority side, and by the gentleman sitting next to the ranking member on the minority side. It is absolutely necessary in view of the fact that we approved the Jones amendment. It makes it necessary for the Secretary to report to the two branches of Congress rather than to the committees relative to any proposals he has, and the Speaker of the House will then refer the matters to the committee having jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the legislation is back on the track now. This is one amendment that does make some sense. I support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank my former chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 7, line 22, after the word "executed", insert a semicolon and strike out lines 23, 24, and 25, and down to and including the semicolon in line 1 on page 8.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I do not know if you realize what you have done, but you have broken a precedent of this House which was established in 1902 after long and serious debate, in which it was decided to give to the western reclamation States interest-free money for irrigation of farmlands. The reason for that was that the funds which came from public lands in the 17 Western States were the moneys which were to be used and reloaned to those States as interest-free money. You have broken that historic pattern. You have decided today that you want to extend those blessings, such as they are, to the 48 States.

All this amendment does is just tell the Members of Congress they are to decide whether or not they are going to try to kid themselves that they can get interest-free money, or that the people in their districts can get interest-free money. This amendment provides that from here on out reclamation projects, whether for putting water on land or for municipal water or for generating electric power, will all pay interest at the amount which Uncle Sam has to pay to borrow that money.

The challenge to you right now is whether or not you really meant what you said, and you now mean, that from here on out there will be no interest-free money for reclamation. That is what the Western States have said they wanted, they did not want to confine it to the 17 Western States, they wanted to spread their blessings all over the United States.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. What about the 160-acre farm? How does that fit into the picture the gentleman is now discussing with regard to interest rates?

Mr. SAYLOR. I have taken that out because that provision provided that farmers would pay interest on the money for irrigation on the farm over 160 acres.

Mr. COOLEY. But the farm under 160 acres would not pay interest?

Mr. SAYLOR. Under 160 acres they would not pay interest. In other words, my amendment now says that all farmers on the land to be irrigated by virtue of reclamation will pay. That is what you said you want. The question is up to you to tell the American public now, you men who come from the 17 Western States, that you have really cut your own throat, you have cooked the goose that has laid the golden egg. You have had it for 53 years, and you now have suddenly decided that you want to extend the blessings to the other States.

Uncle Sam does not have any money to loan anybody anymore. If he puts up the money for any of these \$100 million projects, he has to go out and borrow that money. This is just saying that if you are going to have Uncle Sam borrow \$100 million, Uncle Sam is going to pay interest on it and you are going to be frank with the people who are going to get this money. That is the situation you find yourselves in. It is no longer a matter of frivolity. It is not a question of whether or not Texas wants to belong to the east or the west. You are now going to determine that all reclamation will pay interest on all phases of the work. That is the purpose of this amendment. If you vote this amendment down, you are just showing that what you have done is sheer hypocrisy, because the income from the western public lands is now spread over the 48 States. The income from all the public lands is spread over the 48 States. What you are going to have to do is to face up to the music, and here after pay interest on all money borrowed by the Government for reclamation projects.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not do what the gentleman thinks it does. In the first place, it has no application whatsoever to the existing authority in the reclamation law, unaffected by this legislation, to build irrigation projects and to provide the money for the irrigation features interest free. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, all it means is that the boys in the East and the South will have to pay interest, because the general reclamation law does not apply to them. But for those of us in the 17 Western States, we will not take advantage of this bill. We will go ahead and have the Bureau of Reclamation build these small projects. As I stated earlier today, there is no project, so far as the 17 Western States are concerned, that could be built

under the provisions of this bill which cannot now be built by the Bureau of Reclamation. I tried to make it plain that what we were doing was substituting as a construction agency on small projects the local districts, because they can do it cheaper and because they will do their planning and their engineering and thereby save the Federal Government money by doing it, and because we have seen over a long period of time that this big national agency does not like to build small projects. It wants to build the big ones. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, all it means is that we will throw this bill in the ashcan, so far as the 17 Western States are concerned, and go to the Bureau of Reclamation.

As far as these other people are concerned who have asserted that they want to get in under this program, they are going to be left out in the cold. In other words, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has cut the throats of the people in Pennsylvania and in every other place who might participate in this program, without any injury to us in the far west. It does not hurt us at all in the sense that we could not proceed because we would proceed the other way. We could not proceed as effectively and we could not proceed with local agencies as we would like to, but we could nevertheless proceed. If the gentleman wants to put that kind of program into effect, the thing he should do is to offer a bill to amend the general reclamation law. If the basic premise of the general reclamation law is wrong, it should be repealed in toto and it should be changed across the board. This is no way to do it. I suspect that those folks who live outside the 17 Western States will not look with a great deal of favor upon this amendment and I hope it will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Before we vote on final passage of the bill, I wonder if under the Jones amendment we are voting Texas in or out of the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Some time ago, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], presented 3 amendments, and I objected to their being considered en bloc. Have we voted on all 3 of those amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. Only on the first one.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Have the other two been presented?

The CHAIRMAN. They have not been, and may not be.

Are there any further amendments? If not, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. COOPER having resumed the chair

as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PRESTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and pursuant to House Resolution 248, he reported the bill back to the House, with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOEVEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies, and the Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOEVEN moves to recommit the bill H. R. 5881 to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with instructions to report the bill back forthwith, with the following amendment: On page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike "all forty-eight States" and substitute the following: "the seventeen western reclamation States."

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 39, noes 116.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 62, nays 229, not voting 143, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—62

Andersen,	Bray	Gentry
H. Carl	Brown, Ohio	Gross
Andresen,	Brownson	Haley
August H.	Chase	Harvey
Baumhart	Chipperfield	Hoeven
Beamer	Church	Holifield
Bennett, Mich.	Corbett	Jensen
Betts	Cunningham	Johansen
Bolton,	Dies	Knox
Frances P.	Dondero	LeCompte
Bosch	Donovan	Lovre
Bow	Dorn, N. Y.	McCulloch

McGregor
McIntire
Mahon
Miller, Nebr.
Minshall
Nicholson
O'Hara, Minn.
Ostertag
Ray
Reece, Tenn.

Abbitt
Albert
Alexander
Alger
Allen, Ill.
Andrews
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Averly
Bailey
Baldwin
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Becker
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bentley
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Boykin
Boyle
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Broyhill
Buchanan
Buckley
Budge
Burdick
Burleson
Burnside
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Carlyle
Carrigg
Chelf
Chenoweth
Christopher
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Cramer
Crumpacker
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Dempsey
Denton
Devereux
Diggs
Dixon
Dorn, S. C.
Doyle
Durham
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Felghan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Forand

Rees, Kans.
Rogers, Tex.
Sadlak
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Sheppard
Short
Simpson, Ill.

NAYS—229

Ford
Forrester
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
George
Gordon
Grant
Gray
Gregory
Gubser
Hagen
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Hays, Ark.
Hayworth
Herlong
Hiestand
Hill
Holmes
Holt
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Karsten
Kean
Kee
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Krueger
Laird
Landrum
Lankford
Lipscomb
Long
McCormack
McDonough
McDowell
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mailliard
Marshall
Matthews
Meador
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Mills
Mollohan
Morrison
Moss
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.

Smith, Kans.
Springer
Talle
Thompson, Mich.
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Wilson, Ind.
Withrow

O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Osmer
Passman
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Phillips
Pilcher
Poage
Poff
Polk
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Quigley
Rabaut
Rains
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Robson, Ky.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Scudder
Selden
Sieminski
Sikes
Simpson, Pa.
Slisk
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Steed
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tumulty
Udall
Utt
Vanik
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Walter
Watts
Westland
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wright
Young
Younger
Zablocki

Edmondson
Fine
Fino
Fjare
Flynt
Fogarty
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Granahan
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gwinn
Hale
Halleck
Harrison, Nebr.
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Henderson
Heselton
Hess
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holtzman
Hope
Hyde
Jackson
James
Jenkins

Jennings
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Kirwan
Klein
Knutson
Lane
Lanham
Latham
Lesinski
McCarthy
McConnell
Mason
Miller, N. Y.
Morano
Morgan
Moulder
Multer
Mumma
Nelson
Norrell
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Neill
Patman

Patterson
Philbin
Pillion
Prouty
Radwan
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Richards
Riley
Rivers
Rodino
St. George
Scott
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Sheehan
Shelley
Shuford
Siler
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Staggers
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Van Pelt
Weaver
Wharton
Williams, N. Y.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Yates
Zelenko

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Keating for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Weaver for, with Mr. Lanham against.

Mr. Clevenger for, with Mr. Flynt against.
Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Davidson with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Anfusio with Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Cretella.

Mr. Dodd with Mr. Coudert.

Mr. Riley with Mr. Morano.

Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Allen of California.

Mr. Shuford with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Wolverton.

Mr. Fine with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Taber.

Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Heselton.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Hyde.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. James.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Granahan with Mr. Seely-Brown.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Williams of New York.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Cole.

Mr. Yates with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Bowler with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Dolliver.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Gwinn.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.

Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Hillings.

Mr. Dingell with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Byrd with Mr. Wharton.

NOT VOTING—143

Abernethy	Bonner	Colmer
Adair	Bowler	Coudert
Addonizio	Brooks, La.	Cretella
Allen, Calif.	Byrd	Curtis, Mo.
Anfusio	Byrne, Pa.	Davidson
Arends	Canfield	Delaney
Ashley	Carnahan	Derounian
Ayres	Cederberg	Dingell
Baker	Celler	Dodd
Barden	Chatham	Dollinger
Barrett	Chudoff	Dolliver
Bolling	Clark	Donohue
Bolton,	Clevenger	Dowdy
Oliver P.	Cole	Eberharter

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Scrivner.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Cederberg.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.

Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Mumma.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Bolling with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Norrell with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Henderson.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming, Mr. BUDGE, and Mr. PELLY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) there were—ayes 166, noes 48.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the legislation just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMBASSADOR MORGENSTIERNE

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, thousands and thousands of Americans, and we in the House, wish to congratulate Ambassador Morgenstierne on the 45th anniversary of his service. He and his beautiful wife have given a great deal of diplomacy to the world. They know the meaning of good will and warm friendships and kindly courtesy and helpfulness. We have been so lucky to have them in America. We wish them many, many happy years.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 26, 1955]

AMBASSADOR MORGENSTIERNE

Wilhelm Morgenstierne has achieved the distinction of a landmark of Washington, and, in his quiet way, a genial landmark he is, too. Norway's Ambassador is, of course, the dean of the diplomatic corps (which means that he is a sort of Ambassador for the collective body of 77 envoys in Washington, an assignment he fills with a high degree of respect and responsibility). But more than that, today he will celebrate the completion of 45 years of diplomatic service. In

another couple of years he will have retired. By far the bulk of Mr. Morgenstierne's service has been spent in the American Capital, and this was his first post, back in 1910. Since then the Ambassador has been a familiar in the homes of hosts of capitalites as Washington has grown up, and his Embassy has been the scene of thousands of brilliant functions. He and his Canadian-born wife have a genius for entertainment and for friendship. Both of them are diffident on the surface, but, once a connection has been established, they exhibit a warmth and a simplicity which are endearing and, shall we say, very American. They have been good advertisements for Norway. Many a Washingtonian will join the diplomatic corps in spirit as the corps honors its dean today.

ASIA TOWN HALL MISSION

(Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to an outstanding example of the creation of international good will at private, not public, expense. I refer to the Asia Town Hall mission.

Town Hall, Inc., sponsor of America's Town Meeting of the Air, financed the group visit of 12 Asian leaders on a nationwide tour of the United States. During a period of 46 days—March 13 to April 28, 1955—the group visited 22 cities from coast to coast and appeared before 30,000 Americans.

It was my privilege to act as host at lunch to four of the leaders from the Middle East when they visited Washington. They were Mrs. Amina El-Said, journalist of Egypt; Mr. Abdul Kerim Al-Uzri, member of the Parliament of Iraq; Mr. Musa Nasir, educator of Jordan; and Mr. George Haddad, educator of Syria. They were accompanied by Mr. Robert L. Clifford, of Town Hall, to whom a great deal of credit for the success of the Asia Town Hall mission is due. Four other members of the House of Representatives met this group at luncheon: Hon. KATHERINE ST. GEORGE, of New York; Hon. JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota; Hon. LAWRENCE SMITH, of Wisconsin.

After lunch the Asian leaders met Vice President Nixon.

This meeting was typical of many across the country. The Asian leaders met the American people. They corrected many erroneous impressions they had held. By and large, they were sold on the United States and its citizens. It was a great stroke in favor of friendly relations between our people and the people of Asia, an area where we need friends if we ever needed friends anywhere.

And, Mr. Speaker, the beauty of this project is that it did not cost the American taxpayer 1 cent. I understand that the expense of the tour, including overhead and administrative expenses, cost \$70,000.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this privately financed program produced more good will than would a similar Govern-

ment-financed project, which would have cost at least three times as much. Indeed, some of these leaders would not have accepted an invitation if it had come from the United States Government. Furthermore, the privately financed tour enjoyed more freedom, less red tape, and more direct personal contact with our citizens than would have been the case under Government sponsorship.

I say "Hats off to Town Hall for a well-conceived, well-executed program dedicated to the public interest." I hope it will be the policy of this Government to encourage and facilitate more such privately financed cultural exchange projects. They will be effective and important contributions to our foreign policy and our international interests.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I incorporate in my remarks a copy of a brief report on the group visit of the Asian leaders:

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE ASIA TOWN HALL MISSION, MAY 10, 1955

On April 28 the Asia Town Hall mission completed its tour of the United States. During a period of 46 days—March 13 to April 28—the group visited 22 cities from coast to coast, and appeared before over 30,000 Americans.

The purpose of the mission, as announced, was to bring to a large number of Americans more information about the institutions, the problems, and the hopes and aspirations of the peoples of Asia and the Near East. Probably never before has there existed the opportunity for such a frank exchange of views between so many Americans in all walks of life and people representing, in one group, countries extending from Egypt to Japan.

At the present time it is impossible to present a complete report and evaluation of the work of the mission. Town Hall is continuing to receive comments and information from all over the country. However, there is enough background and information to make this preliminary report to those who helped make this project the success that it was.

PERSONNEL OF THE MISSION

The members of the Asia Town Hall mission had been invited by Town Hall to come to the United States especially to participate in this mission. They were selected on the basis of their ability to carry out the objectives of the mission. For half of them it was their first visit to the United States.

Included in the mission were representatives of—

Egypt: Mrs. Amina El-Said, journalist, 4 Kamel Wasses Pasha, Cairo.

India: G. Ramachandran, director, Gandhi-gram Rural Workers Training Center, Madurai district, south India.

Indonesia: Mohamad Roem, lawyer, 58 Djalan Mampang, Djakarta.

Irak: Abdul Kerim al-Uzri, Member of Parliament, Kard el Pasha, Baghdad.

Japan: George K. Togasaki, president, the Nippon Times, Box 521, Tokyo.

Jordan: Musa Nasir, director, Junior College, Bir Zeit.

Pakistan: Princess Abida Sultaan, Karachi.

Philippines: Roberto Villanueva, executive vice president, Manila Chronicle, Manila.

South Vietnam: Cao Thai Bao, Government Commissioner, 59 Gialong Street, Saigon.

Syria: George Haddad, professor, Syrian University, Damascus.

6/20/55

17. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered favorably reported with amendment S. 1792, authorizing the assumption of the insurance obligations of the Federal Employee Group Life Insurance Act of any nonprofit association of Federal employees with its members (p. D587).
18. WATER. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered favorably reported with amendments S. 1391, granting Congressional consent to a water compact between California and Nevada (p. D585).
19. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered favorably reported with amendments H. R. 5881, providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects (pp. D585-6).
20. FOREIGN TRADE. Passed with amendments S. 1894, which would authorize United States participation in the International Finance Corporation (pp. 7510-4).
Sen. Malone spoke in opposition to the authorized functions of GATT and suggested that dire consequences would result from continued participation in this trade organization (pp. 7538-9, 7543-60).
21. PERSONNEL. Passed without amendment S. 2266, an original bill to continue until July 1, 1956 the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act (June 20, p. 7386). The committee report states that: "The Missing Persons Act is the sole authority under which heads of the executive departments are authorized to continue to credit the pay accounts of persons, within the scope of the statute, while missing, missing in action, interned, captured, or in similar status, or to continue, make, or modify allotments to their dependents during such periods of absence. The proposal makes no change in statutes presently in effect; it merely extends until July 1, 1956 the Missing Persons Act which, under existing authority, expires July 1, 1955."
22. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnson scheduled consideration of the following bills on Wed., June 22: S. 972, amending the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 and S. 922, amending the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 (p. 7560).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

23. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Udall inserted an article by Ambassador Romulo of the Philippines maintaining that an intelligent understanding by America of problems of Eastern countries is necessary to an effective program of foreign aid (pp. A4469-71).
Rep. Smith, Wis., inserted an editorial from the Janesville Gazette urging a gradual discontinuance of foreign aid programs (p. A4473).
24. ROADS. Extension of remarks by Rep. Scherer discussing the issues of pending highway legislation and urging support of the highway bill (pp. A4479-81).
Rep. Ayres inserted an advertisement by Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., pointing out the necessity of considering future needs in highway planning (p. A4483).
25. FARM PRICES. Rep. Johnson, Wis., inserted an editorial from a Wisconsin paper stating that declining farm income is forcing farmers off the farms (p. A4485).
26. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Rep. Johnson, Wis., inserted an editorial citing the effectiveness of the advertising program of the American Dairy Association in building up markets for dairy products (p. A4488).

27. POULTRY. Rep. Hand commended a farmers' poultry cooperative of Vineland, N.J., for its success in improving the poultry industry of southern New Jersey (p. A4490).
28. PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Keating inserted an editorial from a New York State newspaper condemning the rigid price support program as ineffective and costly and arguing against its continuance. (pp. A4491-2).
29. ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. Rep. Metcalf inserted a resolution by the Roosevelt County, Mont. Farmers Union advocating the replacement of acreage controls by a marketing quota system for farm products (pp. A4503-4).
30. FARM PRODUCTION. Rep. McDonough inserted a news item stating that Los Angeles County, Calif., leads the nation in shipping of farm products and has become one of the leading agricultural areas in the country (p. A4492).
31. FARM LOANS. Rep. Brown, Ohio, inserted a letter to the editor of the Saturday Evening Post stating that easy loans for farmers lead to speculation in farm products and resulting surpluses (p. A4501).
32. CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION. Rep. Lane opposed the customs simplification bill and inserted some testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee giving arguments against its enactment (pp. A4492-3).
33. RECLAMATION; ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Hosmer opposed the Echo Park Dam project on the grounds that it would invade Dinosaur National Monument, but maintained that failure to include it in the upper Colorado storage project would render the whole project ineffectual (pp. A4494-5). He also inserted statements criticizing other projects included in the upper Colorado project (pp. A4493, A4499).
34. PUBLIC WORKS. Rep. Van Zandt urged support for his bill and for other legislation providing for public works projects in areas having a labor surplus (pp. A4517-8).
35. WILDLIFE. Rep. Younger inserted a letter from Ralph A. Nissen of the California Farm Bureau Federation countering criticisms of the enforcement of game laws by the Fish and Wildlife Service (p. A4520).
36. MONOPOLIES. Rep. Celler inserted his testimony before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency opposing bills to amend the Defense Production Act on the grounds that they would encourage growth of monopolies (pp. A4520-3).

BILLS INTRODUCED

37. LANDS. S. 2278, by Sen. Case, S. Dak. (for himself and Sen. Mundt), to provide for entry and location, on discovery of a valuable source material, upon public lands of the United States classified as or known to be valuable for coal; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 7494).
38. CONTRACTS. S. 2282, by Sen. Morse, to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 by providing for a review by courts of appeals; to Finance Committee (p. 7494).



Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 2444. A bill to repeal section 1157 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2445. A bill for the relief of Knar Carmen Ives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2446. A bill to permit sale of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of cotton that are in excess supply for unrestricted use at current market prices; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 2447. A bill adopting and authorizing a project for the improvement of the Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi, for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 2448. A bill to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands; and

S. 2449. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Leonidas Camarinopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 2450. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; and

S. 2451. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk 39 bills which were sent to me by the Hoover Commission with the request that, as ranking Republican member of the Government Operations Committee, I introduce. I have not had an opportunity to study them all in detail. It is entirely possible that even though I introduce them I might object to certain portions of them. I think it is of sufficient importance, in view of the great respect in which the Hoover Commission is held, that these bills be introduced and referred to the appropriate committees. I urge the committees to which they are referred to hold hearings at the earliest possible moment. I shall be willing and able to testify at the hearings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. McCARTHY (by request):

S. 2452. A bill relating to the transfer of funds by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator;

S. 2453. A bill to change the name of the Federal Housing Administration;

S. 2454. A bill prohibiting a member of the Home Loan Bank Board from being a member of the board of trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation;

S. 2455. A bill to make the Small Business Administration subject to the Government Corporation Control Act;

S. 2456. A bill to change the name of the Public Housing Administration;

S. 2457. A bill to amend section 108 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act;

S. 2458. A bill to amend the Government Corporation Control Act;

S. 2459. A bill to terminate title VII of the Housing Act of 1954 relating to urban planning and reserve of planned public works;

S. 2460. A bill to terminate the authority of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make loans to educational institutions for housing construction;

S. 2461. A bill to terminate certain functions of the Public Housing Administration, and for other purposes;

S. 2462. A bill relating to the equities required with respect to home mortgages purchased under section 305 of the Housing Act of 1954;

S. 2463. A bill to provide for increasing the equities required for the insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration, and for other purposes;

S. 2464. A bill relating to the retirement of the capital stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and for other purposes;

S. 2465. A bill relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase obligations issued pursuant to section 11 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended; and

S. 2466. A bill to make the Rural Electrification Administration subject to the Government Corporation Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2467. A bill relating to the transportation of personal motor vehicles for military or civilian personnel;

S. 2468. A bill to provide for a survey of the production of fertilizer by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for other purposes;

S. 2469. A bill extending the authority of the General Services Administration with respect to warehouses and other storage facilities operated by civilian agencies of the Government;

S. 2470. A bill to add a new title relating to real property management to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended;

S. 2471. A bill to facilitate the transfer of storage facilities between the military departments;

S. 2472. A bill to establish general policies for mobilization purposes governing industrial properties of the United States;

S. 2473. A bill to make the Alaska Railroad subject to the Government Corporation Control Act;

S. 2474. A bill providing for a survey by the Comptroller General of the United States of the operation by the Department of Defense of commissary stores and post exchanges;

S. 2475. A bill to provide for a Commission on Naval Vessels;

S. 2476. A bill relating to the traffic management functions of the General Services Administration;

S. 2477. A bill providing for a simplified performance rating system for Federal employees;

S. 2478. A bill relating to the authority of the Administrator of General Services with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus Government property under the control of executive agencies;

S. 2479. A bill to repeal section 601 of Public Law 155, 82d Congress; and

S. 2480. A bill to provide for improving accounting methods in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2481. A bill relating to hospital and medical care for American merchant seamen, for personnel of the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service, and their dependents, and for Federal employees, and for other purposes;

S. 2482. A bill to establish a National Library of Medicine;

S. 2483. A bill relating to the construction of general hospitals for the Veterans' Administration, the hospitalization of veterans, and for other purposes; and

S. 2484. A bill to provide for a Federal Advisory Council of Health in the Executive Office of the President in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2485. A bill to provide for improvement in the system of personnel administration through the establishment of a senior civil service in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government;

S. 2486. A bill relating to the certification of eligibles under the civil-service laws;

S. 2487. A bill relating to the simplification of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

S. 2488. A bill relating to appeals by veterans under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944;

S. 2489. A bill relating to reduction in personnel procedure and preference of veterans; and

S. 2490. A bill relating to the transfer of Federal employees from the classified civil service to another personnel merit system; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 2491. A bill to provide for the erection of a marker in a national cemetery in honor of the memory of Lt. (jg.) Lorne Parker Pelzer; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2492. A bill to provide for a highway bridge across the Sardis Reservoir near Harmontown, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HENNING, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 2493. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide equal benefits for surviving children of female employees as are provided for surviving children of male employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution designating the period from October 3 to 8, inclusive, 1955, as National Fish Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for Federal cooperation in

non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and for other purposes.

This action is taken by direction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the bill is being introduced on behalf of myself, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE].

The bill proposes to achieve the objectives set forth in the enacting clause under two titles, in order to meet the divergent conditions and geographical considerations which I shall explain briefly. It is generally referred to as the small-projects bill.

Section 1 of title I sets forth that "The purpose of this title is to encourage State and local participation in the development of projects under the Federal reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in the development of similar projects in the 17 western reclamation States by non-Federal organizations."

In major respects, title I is identical to H. R. 5301, reported by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in August 1954, but which failed of action in the Senate during the 83d Congress. Since this title relates only to the 17 western reclamation States, it is drafted as a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws. This title is a substitute for S. 164 and S. 405 of this Congress, which were referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs earlier in the current session.

Title I authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate contracts with irrigation districts or other public organizations for loans on projects, the cost of which shall not exceed \$5 million. Any project for which a loan in excess of \$500,000 is negotiated must be approved by act of Congress. The provisions of section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, requiring projects to be submitted to affected States in a river basin are to be observed except in the case of projects solely for rehabilitation and betterment. In the latter case, the approval of the State or States in which such a project is located must be secured.

Title II of the bill was proposed and drafted by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. It is applicable to the 31 States outside of the reclamation area and to the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. It is to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The purpose of title II, as stated in section 21 of the bill, is to "encourage State and local participation in the development of non-Federal projects similar to those described in title I and to provide for Federal assistance to non-Federal organizations under terms and conditions, so far as found practicable by the Secretary, as described in said title I in the 31 States—outside of the 17 western reclamation States—and in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska."

Title II authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to negotiate contracts with any public agency which has "capacity to contract with the United States," in carrying out its purpose. In addition to the objectives set forth in title I which are peculiarly applicable to the reclama-

tion States, title II extends the provisions of the bill to drainage, water storage, and saline water intrusion control. The purpose of extending the provisions as indicated is to meet conditions in the alluvial areas of the Gulf States where saline water intrusion is a critical problem, and also to aid drainage and water-storage projects outside of the 17 Western reclamation States.

In general, the ground rules in connection with the negotiation of loans and the requirements for approval by the States and the limitations on the Secretary of Agriculture are similar to those required of the Secretary of the Interior in title I.

Each title authorizes appropriations not to exceed \$100 million. Each Secretary is required to report to Congress currently on the receipt of each proposal for a loan and each proposal that has his approval. No contract shall be executed under either title until the Congress shall have appropriated funds for the specific proposal covered by each contract.

It is the intention of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to report promptly on this bill and publication of the text in the RECORD is primarily for the purpose of giving all interested agencies and persons concerned information as to the revised measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2442) to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SECTION 1. The purpose of this title is to encourage State and local participation in the development of projects under the Federal reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in the development of similar projects in the 17 Western reclamation States by non-Federal organizations.

SEC. 2. As used in this title—

(a) The term "construction," in addition to its usual meaning under the Federal reclamation laws, shall include rehabilitation and betterment.

(b) The term "Federal reclamation laws" shall mean the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

(c) The term "organization" shall mean a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a conservancy district, irrigation district, water users' association, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar organization which has capacity to contract with the United States under the Federal reclamation laws.

(d) The term "project" shall mean (1) any complete reclamation or irrigation undertaking or a complete, self-contained, and distinct enterprise which may be a unit of such a larger undertaking, or a rehabilitation and betterment program for an existing irrigation project, authorized to be constructed

pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws, and (ii) any similar undertaking proposal to be constructed by an organization. The term "project" shall not include any such undertaking, unit or program the cost of which exceeds \$5 million: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this definition shall preclude the making of a grant not in excess of \$5 million in accordance with the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of this title, to organizations which qualify for the same and which are not applicants for a loan under this title: *And provided further*, That an organization shall be limited to a contract or contracts under the provisions of this title provided the total of the costs involved does not exceed \$5 million, except as otherwise herein provided.

(e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the benefits provided in this title shall submit a proposal therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a payment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining the proposal.

SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project which has not theretofore been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail comparable to those included in preauthorization reports required for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been submitted for review by the States of the stream basin in which the project is located in like manner as provided in subsection (c), section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), except that the review may be limited to the State or States in which the project is located if the proposal is one solely for rehabilitation and betterment of an existing project, and shall include a proposed allocation of capital costs to functions such that costs for facilities used for a single purpose shall be allocated to that purpose and costs for facilities used for more than one purpose shall be so allocated among the purposes served that each purpose will share equitably in the costs of such joint facilities.

(b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that the organization already holds or can acquire all lands and interests in land (except public and other lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water necessary for the successful construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this title such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided*, That the contribution required of any applicant organization shall not be in excess of 25 percent of the costs of the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects and, in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects, any existing irrigation facilities owned by the applicant organization may be pledged as all or part of any contribution so required.

(c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appropriate State agency designated by him) to be financially feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this title, the Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate a contract with the applicant

organization as provided in section 5: *Provided*, That if any affected State shall object, pursuant to opportunity therefor afforded under the terms of the act of December 22, 1944 (the Flood Control Act of 1944), or if the estimated cost of any project is in excess of \$500,000, no such contract shall be executed until and unless the same shall have been approved by act of Congress, except as hereinbefore provided for rehabilitation and betterment of an existing project: *Provided further*, That prior to submission of any project proposal the Secretary shall afford the applicant organization an opportunity to comment in writing on the conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary with respect to the project proposal and such written comment of the applicant organization shall be included in the matter submitted to the Congress. The Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this title, may reserve from use or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within his administrative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and which are required for use by the project. Any such reservation shall expire at the end of two years unless the repayment contract provided for in section 5 of this title shall have been executed.

(d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to financial feasibility, emergency, or urgent need for the project, whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irrigation water for an existing irrigation project, whether the proposal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irrigation or drainage. All projects works and facilities constructed under this title shall remain under the ownership and control of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of the contract entered into pursuant to section 5 of this title.

SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this title shall set out, among other things—

(a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(b) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded the organization and the time and method of paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1) the sums lent to it in not more than 50 years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first became available; and (2) interest, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury by estimating the average annual yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations or prices during the month of May preceding the fiscal year in which the loan is made, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of such month of May, and by adjusting such estimated average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on which the contract

is executed on that pro rata share of the loan which is attributable to furnishing irrigation benefits in each particular year to land held in private ownership by any one owner in excess of 160 irrigable acres; and (3) in the case of any project involving an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or commercial power produced as an element of the project and incidental to its full development, interest on the unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the loan at a rate as determined in (2) above;

(d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable functions is made, in accordance with regulations with respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal department or agency primarily concerned with those functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such regulations, for operation by the United States or for repayment to the United States of the amount of any such grant; and

(e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as aforesaid. The liability of the United States under any contract entered into pursuant to this title shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the same, and every such contract shall so recite.

SEC. 6. Upon request of an organization which has made or intends to make a proposal under this title the head of any Federal department or agency may make available to the organization any existing engineering, economic, or hydrologic information and printed material that it may have and that will be useful in connection with the planning, design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the project concerned. As agreed upon, the reasonable cost of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the reasonable cost of making and administering any loan under this title shall, to the extent that they would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 5 of this title unless they are otherwise paid for by the organization.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this title.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100 million to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall advise the Congress promptly on the receipt of each proposal referred to in section 3 and, previous to any appropriation, shall have reported to the Congress on each proposal that has his approval, but no contracts shall be executed until the Congress shall have appropriated funds for the specific proposal covered by each contract. All appropriations authorized for the purposes of this title shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under this title, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided.

SEC. 9. This title shall be a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws.

TITLE II

SEC. 21. The purpose of this title is to encourage State and local participation in the development of non-Federal projects similar to those described in title I and to provide for Federal assistance to non-Federal organizations under terms and conditions, so far as found practicable by the Secretary, as described in said title I in the 31 States (outside of the 17 western reclamation States) and in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

SEC. 22. As used in this title—

(a) The term "construction," in addition to its usual meaning under the Federal reclamation laws, shall include rehabilitation and betterment, drainage, and control of saline water intrusion.

(b) The term "Federal reclamation laws" shall mean the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

(c) The term "organization" shall mean a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a conservancy district, irrigation district, drainage district, water users' association, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar organization which has capacity to contract with the United States.

(d) The term "project" shall mean (i) any complete reclamation, drainage, water storage, saline water intrusion control, or irrigation undertaking or a complete, self-contained, and distinct enterprise which may be a unit of such a larger undertaking, or a rehabilitation and betterment program for an existing irrigation project, and (ii) any similar undertaking proposal to be constructed by an organization. The term "project" shall not include any such undertaking, unit, or program the cost of which exceeds \$5 million: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this definition shall preclude the making of a grant not in excess of \$5 million in accordance with the provisions of sections 24 and 25 of this title, to organizations which qualify for the same and which are not applicants for a loan under this title: *And provided further*, That an organization shall be limited to a contract or contracts under the provisions of this title provided the total of the costs involved does not exceed \$5 million, except as otherwise herein provided.

(e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 23. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the benefits provided in this title shall submit a proposal therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a payment of \$1,000 to defray in part the cost of examining the proposal.

SEC. 24. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project shall set forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail and any other information required by the Secretary; shall have been submitted for review by any States likely to be materially affected by the project.

(b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that the organization already holds or can acquire all lands and interests in land (except public and other lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water necessary for the successful construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this title such portion of the cost of the cost of construction (which portion shall include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided*, That the contribution required of any applicant organization shall not be in excess of 25 percent of the costs of the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects and, in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects, any existing irrigation facilities owned by the applicant organization may be pledged as all or part of any contribution so required.

(c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appropriate State agency des-

igned by him) to be financially feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this title, the Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as provided in section 25: *Provided*, That if any affected State shall object, or if the estimated cost of any project is in excess of \$500,000, no such contract shall be executed until and unless the same shall have been approved by act of Congress, except as hereinbefore provided for rehabilitation and betterment of any existing project: *Provided further*, That prior to submission of any project proposal the Secretary shall afford the applicant organization an opportunity to comment in writing on the conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary with respect to the project proposal and such written comment of the applicant organization shall be included in the matter submitted to the Congress. The Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this title, may reserve from use or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within his administrative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and which are required for use by the project. Any such reservation shall expire at the end of 2 years unless the repayment contract provided for in section 25 of this title shall have been executed.

(d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to financial feasibility, emergency, or urgent need for the project, whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irrigation water for an existing irrigation project, whether drainage benefits are involved, whether the proposal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irrigation or drainage. All project works and facilities constructed under this title shall remain under the ownership and control of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of the contract entered into pursuant to section 25 of this title.

SEC. 25. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 24 of this title shall set out, among other things—

(a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project.

(b) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded the organization and the time and method of paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to non-reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1) the sums lent to it in not more than 50 years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available; and (2) interest, at the average rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, paid on the long-term interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on which the contract is executed on that pro rata share of the loan which is attributable to furnishing domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or commercial power produced as an element of the project and incidental to its full development;

(d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant predicated upon its performance

of nonreimbursable functions is made, in accordance with regulations with respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal department or agency primarily concerned with those functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such regulations, for operation by the United States or for repayment to the United States of the amount of any such grant; and

(e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as aforesaid. The liability of the United States under any contract entered into pursuant to this title shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the same, and every such contract shall so recite.

SEC. 26. Upon request of an organization which has made or intends to make a proposal under this title, the head of any Federal department or agency may make available to the organization any existing engineering, economic, or hydrologic information and printed material that it may have and that will be useful in connection with the planning, design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the project concerned. As agreed upon, the reasonable cost of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the reasonable cost of making and administering any loan under this title shall, to the extent that they would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 25 of this title unless they are otherwise paid for by the organization.

SEC. 27. The Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this title, and shall report the same to Congress currently.

SEC. 28. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100 million to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall advise the Congress promptly on the receipt of each proposal referred to in section 23 and, previous to any appropriation, shall have reported to the Congress on each proposal that has his approval, but no contracts shall be executed until the Congress shall have appropriated funds for the specific proposal covered by each contract. All appropriations authorized for the purposes of this title shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under this title, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 31. The planning and construction of projects undertaken pursuant to this act shall be subject to all procedural requirements and other provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080) except in the case of projects solely for rehabilitation and betterment.

SEC. 32. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person, organization or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to persons, organizations or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

IMPROVEMENT OF TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ALABAMA AND MISSISSIPPI

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill

which proposes to adopt and authorize a project for the improvement of the Tombigbee River and its tributaries. This is a companion bill to H. R. 6924 introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative THOMAS ABERNETHY, of the First District of Mississippi.

I have given this project special study and feel that it is a sound and desirable project and offers a practical solution to the flood control problems of 595,000 people directly affected. The project has been considered by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and by the Chief of Army Engineers, and has received their approval.

Damaging floods which occur frequently in the basin covered by this project are a continuous problem of agriculture and industry in the area.

Take, for example, Columbus, Miss., which is located in this basin. The flood stage on the Tombigbee River has been equalled or exceeded 87 times in 60 years of record, an average of 1.5 times per year. Twenty-five of these floods were in the cropping season, and 5 of these were major in their destruction. At Columbus, 865 residents and 75 business establishments are in the flood basin on both sides of the Tombigbee River and Luxapalila Creek and continually subjected to unexpected and damaging floods.

The Corps of Engineers points out that flooding occurs on the principal tributaries on the average of 2 to 8 times a year, and on minor tributaries on an average of 5 to 14 times a year. The area covered under this project includes 534,900 acres. Two hundred thirty-seven thousand, six hundred acres of this total are along the Tombigbee River, and the balance of 297,300 acres along the many tributaries. More than 192,000 acres of this land have been cleared for cultivation and are producing cotton, corn, hay, and other important crops.

This agricultural land, as well as a number of industries in this basin, suffer serious financial loss each year as a result of floods.

This project, if approved, will provide needed relief to many people and will offer greater opportunity in production of agricultural crops and livestock.

This project will include channel clearing and rectification on 22 tributary streams at an estimated cost to the United States for construction of \$14,445,000 and provides that responsible local interests give satisfactory assurance that they will contribute financially in the development of this program.

I firmly believe this project will contribute greatly to a stronger economy in this area. I hope the Senate Public Works Committee will give it favorable consideration at the earliest possible date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2447) adopting and authorizing a project for the improvement of the Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi, for flood control, introduced by Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2442

JULY 11, 1955

A BILL

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I

SECTION 1. The purpose of this title is to encourage State and local participation in the development of projects under the Federal reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in the development of similar projects in the seventeen western reclamation States by non-Federal organizations.

1 SEC. 2. As used in this title—

2 (a) The term “construction”, in addition to its usual
3 meaning under the Federal reclamation laws, shall include
4 rehabilitation and betterment.

5 (b) The term “Federal reclamation laws” shall mean
6 the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amend-
7 atory thereof or supplementary thereto.

8 (c) The term “organization” shall mean a State or a
9 department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a
10 conservancy district, irrigation district, water users’ associa-
11 tion, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar
12 organization which has capacity to contract with the United
13 States under the Federal reclamation laws.

14 (d) The term “project” shall mean (i) any complete
15 reclamation or irrigation undertaking or a complete, self-
16 contained, and distinct enterprise which may be a unit of such
17 a larger undertaking, or a rehabilitation and betterment
18 program for an existing irrigation project, authorized to be
19 constructed pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws, and
20 (ii) any similar undertaking proposal to be constructed by
21 an organization. The term “project” shall not include any
22 such undertaking, unit or program the cost of which exceeds
23 \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this defini-
24 tion shall preclude the making of a grant not in excess of
25 \$5,000,000 in accordance with the provisions of sections

1 4 and 5 of this title, to organizations which qualify for the
2 same and which are not applicants for a loan under this
3 title: *And provided further*, That an organization shall be
4 limited to a contract or contracts under the provisions of
5 this title provided the total of the costs involved does not
6 exceed \$5,000,000, except as otherwise herein provided.

7 (e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary
8 of the Interior.

9 SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the
10 benefits provided in this title shall submit a proposal therefor
11 to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall pre-
12 scribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a pay-
13 ment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining
14 the proposal.

15 SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construc-
16 tion of a project which has not theretofore been authorized
17 for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set
18 forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail
19 comparable to those included in preauthorization reports re-
20 quired for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been
21 submitted for review by the States of the stream basin in
22 which the project is located in like manner as provided in
23 subsection (c), section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944
24 (58 Stat. 887), except that the review may be limited to the
25 State or States in which the project is located if the proposal

1 is one solely for rehabilitation and betterment of an existing
2 project, and shall include a proposed allocation of cap-
3 ital costs to functions such that costs for facilities used
4 for a single purpose shall be allocated to that purpose and
5 costs for facilities used for more than one purpose shall be
6 so allocated among the purposes served that each purpose
7 will share equitably in the costs of such joint facilities.

8 (b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that
9 the organization already holds or can acquire all lands
10 and interests in land (except public and other lands and
11 interests in land owned by the United States which are
12 within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and
13 subject to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water
14 necessary for the successful construction, operation, and
15 maintenance of the project and that it is ready, able, and will-
16 ing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this
17 title such portion of the cost of construction (which portion
18 shall include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and
19 rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have
20 advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided*, That the
21 contribution required of any applicant organization shall not
22 be in excess of 25 per centum of the costs of the project
23 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation
24 project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable func-
25 tions under general provisions of law applicable to such proj-

1 ects and, in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects,
2 any existing irrigation facilities owned by the applicant or-
3 ganization may be pledged as all or part of any contributions
4 so required.

5 (c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the
6 Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appro-
7 priate State agency designated by him) to be financially
8 feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the
9 requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the
10 provisions of this title, the Secretary is hereby authorized to
11 negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as pro-
12 vided in section 5: *Provided*, That if any affected State
13 shall object, pursuant to opportunity therefor afforded under
14 the terms of the Act of December 22, 1944 (the Flood
15 Control Act of 1944), or if the estimated cost of any project
16 is in excess of \$500,000, no such contract shall be executed
17 until and unless the same shall have been approved by
18 Act of Congress, except as hereinbefore provided for re-
19 habilitation and betterment of an existing project: *Provided*
20 *further*, That prior to submission of any project proposal the
21 Secretary shall afford the applicant organization an oppor-
22 tunity to comment in writing on the conclusions and recom-
23 mendations of the Secretary with respect to the project
24 proposal and such written comment of the applicant organ-
25 ization shall be included in the matter submitted to the

1 Congress. The Secretary at the time of submitting the
2 project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determi-
3 nation that the requested project constitutes a reasonable
4 risk under the provisions of this title, may reserve from use
5 or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests
6 in land owned by the United States which are within his
7 administrative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him
8 and which are required for use by the project. Any such
9 reservation shall expire at the end of two years unless the
10 repayment contract provided for in section 5 of this title shall
11 have been executed.

12 (d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to
13 financial feasibility, emergency or urgent need for the project,
14 whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irriga-
15 tion water for an existing irrigation project, whether the pro-
16 posal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project
17 works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irri-
18 gation or drainage. All project works and facilities con-
19 structed under this title shall remain under the ownership
20 and control of the local contracting organization subject to
21 the terms of the contract entered into pursuant to section 5
22 of this title.

23 SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under
24 the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this title shall
25 set out, among other things—

1 (a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made
2 to the organization and the time and method of making
3 the same available to the organization. Said loan shall
4 not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project
5 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal recla-
6 mation project, would be properly allocable to reim-
7 bursable functions under general provisions of law
8 applicable to such projects;

9 (b) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded
10 the organization and the time and method of paying the
11 same to the organization. Said grant shall not exceed that
12 portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project
13 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation
14 project, would be properly allocable to nonreimbursable
15 functions under general provisions of law applicable to such
16 projects;

17 (c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1)
18 the sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the
19 date when the principal benefits of the project first become
20 available; and (2) interest, as determined by the Secretary
21 of the Treasury, by estimating the average annual yield
22 to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quota-
23 tions or prices during the month of May preceding the
24 fiscal year in which the loan is made, on all outstanding
25 marketable obligations of the United States having a matu-

1 rity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of such
2 month of May, and by adjusting such estimated average
3 annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum
4 at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on
5 which the contract is executed on that pro rata share of
6 the loan which is attributable to furnishing irrigation benefits
7 in each particular year to land held in private ownership
8 by any one owner in excess of one hundred and sixty ir-
9 rigable acres; and (3) in the case of any project involving
10 an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water sup-
11 ply, or commercial power produced as an element of the
12 project and incidental to its full development, interest on
13 the unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the
14 loan at a rate as determined in (2) above;

15 (d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant
16 predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable
17 functions is made, in accordance with regulations with
18 respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal
19 department or agency primarily concerned with those
20 functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such
21 regulations, for operation by the United States or for
22 repayment to the United States of the amount of any
23 such grant; and

24 (e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem
25 necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security

1 for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as afore-
2 said. The liability of the United States under any con-
3 tract entered into pursuant to this title shall be contin-
4 gent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out
5 the same, and every such contract shall so recite.

6 SEC. 6. Upon request of an organization which has
7 made or intends to make a proposal under this title the
8 head of any Federal department or agency may make avail-
9 able to the organization any existing engineering, economic,
10 or hydrologic information and printed material that it may
11 have and that will be useful in connection with the planning,
12 design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the
13 project concerned. As agreed upon, the reasonable cost
14 of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material
15 furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and
16 the reasonable cost of making and administering any loan
17 under this title shall, to the extent that they would not be
18 nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under
19 the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and cov-
20 ered in the provisions of the contract entered into under sec-
21 tion 5 of this title unless they are otherwise paid for by the
22 organization.

23 SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform any

1 and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be
2 necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this title.

3 SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
4 such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,000,-
5 000 to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That
6 the Secretary shall advise the Congress promptly on the
7 receipt of each proposal referred to in section 3 and, previous
8 to any appropriation, shall have reported to the Congress
9 on each proposal that has his approval, but no contracts
10 shall be executed until the Congress shall have appropriated
11 funds for the specific proposal covered by each contract.
12 All appropriations authorized for the purposes of this title
13 shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as
14 they are used to finance loans made under this title, be
15 reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided.

16 SEC. 9. This title shall be a supplement to the Federal
17 reclamation laws.

18 TITLE II

19 SEC. 21. The purpose of this title is to encourage State
20 and local participation in the development of non-Federal
21 projects similar to those described in title I and to provide
22 for Federal assistance to non-Federal organizations under
23 terms and conditions, so far as found practicable by the Sec-
24 retary, as described in said title I in the thirty-one States

1 (outside of the seventeen western reclamation States) and
2 in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

3 SEC. 22. As used in this title—

4 (a) The term “construction”, in addition to its usual
5 meaning under the Federal reclamation laws, shall include
6 rehabilitation and betterment, drainage and control of saline
7 water intrusion.

8 (b) The term “Federal reclamation laws” shall mean
9 the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amend-
10 atory thereof or supplementary thereto.

11 (c) The term “organization” shall mean a State or a
12 department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a
13 conservancy district, irrigation district, drainage district,
14 water users’ association, an agency created by interstate com-
15 pact, or similar organization which has capacity to contract
16 with the United States.

17 (d) The term “project” shall mean (i) any complete
18 reclamation, drainage, water storage, saline water intrusion
19 control, or irrigation undertaking or a complete, self-con-
20 tained, and distinct enterprise which may be a unit of such
21 a larger undertaking, or a rehabilitation and betterment
22 program for an existing irrigation project, and (ii) any
23 similar undertaking proposed to be constructed by an organ-
24 ization. The term “project” shall not include any such
25 undertaking, unit, or program the cost of which exceeds

1 \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this defi-
2 nition shall preclude the making of a grant not in excess of
3 \$5,000,000 in accordance with the provisions of sections 24
4 and 25 of this title, to organizations which qualify for the
5 same and which are not applicants for a loan under this
6 title: *And provided further*, That an organization shall be
7 limited to a contract or contracts under the provisions of
8 this title provided the total of the costs involved does not
9 exceed \$5,000,000, except as otherwise herein provided.

10 (e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of
11 Agriculture.

12 SEC. 23. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the
13 benefits provided in this title shall submit a proposal therefor
14 to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall pre-
15 scribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a pay-
16 ment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining
17 the proposal.

18 SEC. 24. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construc-
19 tion of a project shall set forth, among other things, a plan
20 and estimated cost in detail and any other information re-
21 quired by the Secretary; shall have been submitted for review
22 by any States likely to be materially affected by the project.

23 (b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that
24 the organization already holds or can acquire all lands
25 and interests in land (except public and other lands and

1 interests in land owned by the United States which are
2 within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and
3 subject to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water
4 necessary for the successful construction, operation, and
5 maintenance of the project and that it is ready, able, and will-
6 ing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this
7 title such portion of the cost of construction (which portion
8 shall include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and
9 rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have
10 advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided*, That the
11 contribution required of any applicant organization shall not
12 be in excess of 25 per centum of the costs of the project
13 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation
14 project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable func-
15 tions under general provisions of law applicable to such proj-
16 ects and, in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects,
17 any existing irrigation facilities owned by the applicant or-
18 ganization may be pledged as all or part of any contribution
19 so required.

20 (c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the
21 Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appro-
22 priate State agency designated by him) to be financially
23 feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the
24 requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the
25 provisions of this title, the Secretary is hereby authorized to

1 negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as pro-
2 vided in section 25: *Provided*, That if any affected State
3 shall object, or if the estimated cost of any project is
4 in excess of \$500,000, no such contract shall be executed
5 until and unless the same shall have been approved by
6 Act of Congress, except as hereinbefore provided for re-
7 habilitation and betterment of any existing project: *Provided*
8 *further*, That prior to submission of any project proposal
9 the Secretary shall afford the applicant organization an
10 opportunity to comment in writing on the conclusions and
11 recommendations of the Secretary with respect to the project
12 proposal and such written comment of the applicant organ-
13 ization shall be included in the matter submitted to the
14 Congress. The Secretary at the time of submitting the
15 project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determina-
16 tion that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk
17 under the provisions of this title, may reserve from use or
18 disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests
19 in land owned by the United States which are within his
20 administrative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him
21 and which are required for use by the project. Any such
22 reservation shall expire at the end of two years unless the
23 repayment contract provided for in section 25 of this title
24 shall have been executed.

25 (d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to

1 financial feasibility, emergency, or urgent need for the project,
2 whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irriga-
3 tion water for an existing irrigation project, whether drain-
4 age benefits are involved, whether the proposal involves
5 rehabilitation of existing irrigation project works, and
6 whether the proposed project is primarily for irrigation or
7 drainage. All project works and facilities constructed under
8 this title shall remain under the ownership and control of
9 the local contracting organization subject to the terms of the
10 contract entered into pursuant to section 25 of this title.

11 SEC. 25. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under
12 the provisions of subsection (c) of section 24 of this title
13 shall set out, among other things—

14 (a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made
15 to the organization and the time and method of making
16 the same available to the organization. Said loan shall
17 not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project.

18 (b) the maximum amount of any grant to be
19 accorded the organization and the time and method of
20 paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall
21 not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of con-
22 structing the project which, if it were being constructed
23 as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly
24 allocable to nonreimbursable functions under general
25 provisions of law applicable to such projects;

1 (c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1)
2 the sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the
3 date when the principal benefits of the project first be-
4 come available; and (2) interest, at the average rate, as
5 determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, paid on the
6 long-term interest-bearing marketable securities of the
7 United States outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal
8 year preceding the date on which the contract is executed
9 on that pro rata share of the loan which is attributable to
10 furnishing domestic, industrial, or municipal water sup-
11 ply, or commercial power produced as an element of the
12 project and incidental to its full development;

13 (d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant
14 predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable
15 functions is made, in accordance with regulations with
16 respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal
17 department or agency primarily concerned with those
18 functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such
19 regulations, for operation by the United States or for
20 repayment to the United States of the amount of any
21 such grant; and

22 (e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem
23 necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security
24 for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as afore-
25 said. The liability of the United States under any con-

1 tract entered into pursuant to this title shall be contin-
2 gent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out
3 the same, and every such contract shall so recite.

4 SEC. 26. Upon request of an organization which has
5 made or intends to make a proposal under this title, the
6 head of any Federal department or agency may make avail-
7 able to the organization any existing engineering, economic,
8 or hydrologic information and printed material that it may
9 have and that will be useful in connection with the planning,
10 design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the
11 project concerned. As agreed upon, the reasonable cost
12 of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material
13 furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and
14 the reasonable cost of making and administering any loan
15 under this title shall, to the extent that they would not be
16 nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under
17 the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and cov-
18 ered in the provisions of the contract entered into under sec-
19 tion 25 of this title unless they are otherwise paid for by the
20 organization.

21 SEC. 27. The Secretary is authorized to perform any
22 and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may
23 be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of
24 this title, and shall report the same to Congress currently.

25 SEC. 28. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated

1 such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,000,-
2 000 to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That
3 the Secretary shall advise the Congress promptly on the
4 receipt of each proposal referred to in section 23 and, previous
5 to any appropriation, shall have reported to the Congress
6 on each proposal that has his approval, but no contracts
7 shall be executed until the Congress shall have appropriated
8 funds for the specific proposal covered by each contract.
9 All appropriations authorized for the purposes of this title
10 shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as
11 they are used to finance loans made under this title, be
12 reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided.

13 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

14 SEC. 31. The planning and construction of projects
15 undertaken pursuant to this Act shall be subject to all pro-
16 cedural requirements and other provisions of the Act of
17 August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), except in the case of
18 projects solely for rehabilitation and betterment.

19 SEC. 32. If any provision of this Act or the applica-
20 tion of such provision to any person, organization, or circum-
21 stance shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and
22 the application of such provision to persons, organizations,
23 or circumstances other than those as to which it is held
24 invalid shall not be affected thereby.

A BILL

To provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. LONG, Mr. BARRETT, and
Mr. BIBLE

JULY 11, 1955

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior
and Insular Affairs

A BILL

to amend the law relating to the power of the
Federal Reserve Board to issue orders
and regulations under the Federal Reserve
Act.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives
of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

That be it

enacted, That the Federal Reserve Board shall have the power to

PROVIDING FOR FEDERAL COOPERATION IN NON-FEDERAL PROJECTS AND FOR PARTICIPATION BY NON-FEDERAL AGENCIES IN FEDERAL PROJECTS

JULY 21, 1955.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted the following

REPORT WITH INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

[To accompany S. 2442]

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill, S. 2442, to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

AMENDMENTS

Page 4, line 15, after the word "that" insert the following: "(except in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects)".

Page 5, lines 1 and 2, after the word "and" strike the comma and the following: "in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects, any existing".

Line 3, strike the word "may" and insert in lieu thereof the word "shall"; strike the words "contributions so required" and insert in lieu thereof "security for repayment".

Page 13, line 5, after the word "that" insert "(except in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects)".

Beginning on line 16, strike the first comma and the following: "in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects, any existing".

Line 17, after "irrigation" insert "or other".

Lines 17 and 18, after "organization" insert a comma and the following: "as well as other assets or income of the applicant organization,".

Lines 18 and 19, strike "contribution so required.", and insert in lieu thereof "security for repayment."

Page 14, lines 6 and 7, strike the comma after "Congress" and the remainder of line 6 and line 7 to the colon.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

In the last days of the 2d session of the 83d Congress, the committee, after a review of House committee hearings, reported H. R. 5301 with amendments. S. 164, as introduced, is identical to H. R. 5301 as reported. The bill was not acted on in the Senate, however, and the committee therefore held hearings on S. 164 and a companion bill, S. 405, on February 8, and March 31, 1955. Comments from the Department of the Interior were received, together with testimony of organizations and interests from the reclamation States, which have long been urging the legislation. As a result of the views and recommendations presented, and consideration of H. R. 5881, which is before it, the committee recommends a new measure, S. 2442, with titles I, II, and III.

PROVISIONS AND PURPOSES OF TITLE I

Title I applies in the 17 western reclamation States, permitting them, their agencies, and interstate agencies created by interstate compacts, to construct small reclamation enterprises with partial Federal financial aid for such undertakings on a loan-and-grant basis when found feasible by the Secretary of the Interior and authorized by the Congress. The provisions of reclamation laws, generally, will apply in the operation of these small enterprises. They must be shown to be justified under criteria used in normal reclamation procedures with respect to approval and authorization.

The limit of Federal financial aid (including both loans and grants) may be held to 75 percent of the total cost of a project by the Secretary under certain conditions, and in no case may Federal funds exceed that proportion required to construct a project costing \$5 million for a complete, self-contained system as to its physical elements. Loans are authorized for reimbursable costs, so allocated. Grants are authorized for allocations to flood control, navigation, or other recognized purposes as defined in the reclamation laws.

The committee heard evidence to the effect that there was neither opportunity nor intention on the part of local interests to expand such enterprises into major reclamation developments on a step-by-step basis. The bill does, however, provide for several developments by an agency which total less than \$5 million. Projects costing less than \$500,000 do not require authorization by Congress unless interstate questions arise.

The period of repayment of loans is 50 years. Landholdings may be in excess of 160 acres for any individual, but owners of excess land are required to pay interest on loans prorated to such excess irrigable holdings. Allocations of reimbursable costs to municipal purposes and to commercial power shall be repaid with interest.

The bill, the committee believes, fully provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall be assured of adequate security for prompt repayment of the loan, and that enactment of the legislation will

meet the need in the West for Federal cooperation in the development of small projects. It is recognized that this method of development will result in lower overhead charges, often in improved local cooperation, and in lower total costs to water users. These elements will tend toward lesser advances from the Federal Treasury.

An excellent summary of the objectives of the bill is given in the report of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs accompanying H. R. 5881, which includes the objectives of this bill, in the following:

There has long existed a need for legislation establishing a simplified planning, review, and authorization procedure for small reclamation projects. Also, it has long been recognized that more active participation by local interests in the development of their land and water resources would be desirable. This legislation would meet the need for small projects legislation and would also encourage more active participation by local water users' organizations.

The President, in his fiscal year 1956 budget message, stated:

"To the greatest extent possible the responsibility for resource development and its cost should be borne by those who receive the benefits. In many instances private interests or State and local governments can best carry on the needed programs."

It is the conclusion of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that the construction and operation of small irrigation and reclamation projects is a phase of the reclamation program which, in many instances, can be assumed by local agencies to the benefit of both those agencies and the Federal Government.

The bill does not waive compliance with the provisions of the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment (sec. 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944), but the committee believes it should apply to projects for rehabilitation and betterment only with limitations, such projects, of course, having recognized water rights.

Favorable reports from the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Interior relating to title I are attached hereto.

PROVISIONS AND PURPOSES OF TITLE II

Title II authorizes Federal aid in the construction of small projects for irrigation, drainage, water storage, and saline water intrusion control in the 31 States which lie easterly from the arid lands comprising the 17 reclamation States, and in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. Federal loans and grants may be made only after recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture. Projects requiring loans greater than \$500,000 would also require authorization by the Congress. The rules governing loans and grants, interest charges and allocations shall be similar to those set forth in title I except that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the discretionary authority to require the pledge of assets and income of the applicant organization in addition to the project works.

The committee recognizes that the needs of the 31 States easterly of the arid section of the Nation differ from arid areas. In some instances the need to drain water from swamplands is more pressing than that of providing water for irrigation purposes. In some instances, coastal States experience the problem in both respects. There is sometime the need of draining water from property during one season, storing it for later use, and returning it by means of irrigation at a subsequent time. In other instances the intrusion of salt water makes unusable supplies of fresh water that would otherwise be adequate for agricultural and other purposes.

It was the judgment of the committee that the experience of those who had assisted with soil-conservation practices should be helpful in initiating the new program. Generally speaking, the practices and procedures in the reclamation areas might prove to be inappropriate in the 31 States involved in title II.

The committee does not anticipate the creation of a large administrative or field service to administer title II. For the most part the Department of Agriculture already has available the personnel and the type of experience necessary to undertake the purpose of title II.

The committee has included safeguards, as in title I, to assure (1) repayments of loans, (2) compliance with local and State legal procedures, and (3) reports by applicants to meet standards of the Secretary of Agriculture.

It is the intention of the committee that in making appropriations under title II, there shall be no funds allotted or appropriated from the reclamation fund set up by the reclamation law of 1902.

PROVISIONS OF TITLE III

Title III provides that projects undertaken pursuant to the bill shall be subject to provisions of the act of August 14, 1946, an act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, game, and other purposes.

Section 32 of title III contains the standard separability clause.

TEXT OF S. 2442 PRINTED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

S. 2442 was introduced in the Senate on July 11, 1955, and printed in full in the Congressional Record with a statement by the acting chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The statement gave notice to all interested agencies and persons that the committee proposed to report out the measure promptly as a substitute for S. 164 and S. 405. The committee subsequently considered the substitute bill and on July 19 ordered it reported with amendments as indicated.

COMMENTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

The reports of the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Department of Agriculture, with reference to H. R. 5881, are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington 25, D. C., March 17, 1955.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Reports have been requested from this Department on S. 164 and S. 405, both of which are bills to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

The general position of the Department of the Interior with respect to these two bills is the same as that which it took with respect to S. 1628, 83d Congress, in its letter of April 20, 1954, to your committee and with respect to H. R. 5301, 83d Congress, in its letter of April 16, 1954, to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In those letters we said that we were in accord with what we understood to be the principal purpose of S. 1628 and H. R. 5301, viz., that of encouraging participation by State and local agencies in the development of reclamation projects through Federal loans and grants to such agencies. We also said that the field of action which would be opened to this Department by the

enactment of legislation carrying out such a purpose would be a wide one and would be a desirable complement to that which is now open to it under the Federal reclamation laws. In addition your committee will be interested to note that the President's budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, forecasts (p. 830) the later transmission, upon enactment of suitable basic legislation, of a request for a \$10 million appropriation "to provide for Federal cooperation with State, local governments, or private persons in their water-resource developments."

The two bills that are now before us vary somewhat from each other and from the draft of measure which we recommended for consideration last year. The principal differences are these:

(1) Both bills are limited to the 17 Western States. Our recommendation was for a program that, subject to congressional consideration as individual proposals came along, would be nationwide.

(2) Both bills propose that their benefits shall extend only to projects or units or features of projects having an estimated cost of not more than \$5 million. Our recommendation did not include a dollar limitation. The language of the two bills varies somewhat in the definition of the term "project" but, apart from the \$5 million limitation, that of S. 164 follows closely the definition recommended by us.

(3) S. 164 would, if enacted, require review of any proposal coming under it by all of the States of the river basin in which the project is to be located; S. 405 would require review only by the particular State or States in which the project is to be located. Our proposal was the same as that of S. 164 in this respect.

(4) Neither S. 164 nor S. 405 contains provisions, such as those which were suggested in our draft substitute for H. R. 5301, to implement their declared purpose of encouraging State and local participation in the development of projects authorized under the Federal reclamation laws as well as the development of similar projects not so authorized. In other words, the details of these bills treat only with the latter class of undertakings.

(5) Both bills propose a limitation of 25 percent of the reimbursable costs of the project as the amount which may be required to be contributed by an applicant organization. This limitation will, in some cases, override the bills' other requirement that the organization bear "all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and rights to the use of water" required for the success of the project. Our recommendation with respect to H. R. 5301 placed no limit on the proportion of the cost which the applicant organization might be required to bear, specifically provided that all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and rights to the use of water be borne by the organization in the case of all non-Federal projects, and provided in general that preference should be given to applicants in the order of the proportion of contributions proposed to be made by them.

(6) S. 164 provides that contracts involving projects the estimated cost of which is over \$200,000 shall not be executed by the Secretary until the project proposal and the contract have been approved by act of Congress. S. 405 provides for execution of all contracts by the Secretary after a stated period during which a proposal is required to lie before the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives or, if the Congress is not in session, before the chairman and ranking minority member of each such committee. Our proposal envisaged affirmative approval by the Congress of every proposal before a contract is negotiated and executed.

(7) Both of the bills contemplate the making of loans to finance incidental power developments. Neither of them, it may be added, is altogether clear whether the provision for payment of interest is applicable both to pumping power and to commercial power or only to the latter. Our proposal involved power only insofar as it would be used for pumping purposes and contemplated non-interest-bearing loans for that purpose.

Many of the points of difference between S. 164 and S. 405, on the one hand, and our draft of substitute for H. R. 5301, on the other hand, were carefully considered by your committee last year and require no comment at this time. With respect to others, however, and particularly with respect to those which bear upon the problem of the extent of Federal participation, your attention is invited to the letter dated April 9, 1954, from the Bureau of the Budget which was attached to our report of H. R. 5301 and reprinted in Senate Report No. 2472, 83d Congress. The general tenor of the Bureau of the Budget's letter was to urge increased non-Federal participation in the development and financing of small projects. We recommend that your committee reexamine particularly the matters outlined under (5) and (7) above and that the bills be amended to exclude from their coverage loans for the development of commercial power facilities, to remove the limitation on the proportion of local contributions that the Secre-

tary may require, to provide that the local organizations shall, in all cases, be required to finance the cost of land and water-right acquisitions except in those instances in which Government lands within the administrative jurisdiction of this Department are involved or in which the lands or water rights have already been acquired by the Government for an authorized reclamation project, and to provide that the contracting organization shall be required to repay all costs incurred by the Government which would be repayable by it if the undertaking were being constructed by the Government.

We recommend that, with appropriate amendments, S. 164 or S. 405 be enacted.

Because we are informed that there is a particular urgency for the submission of the views of this Department on S. 164 and S. 405 on which, I am advised, your committee has already held hearings, this report is being submitted prior to clearance through the Bureau of the Budget. In these circumstances, no commitment can be made concerning the relation of the bills or of the views herein expressed to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington 25, D. C., June 6, 1955.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Under date of March 17, 1955, the Department of the Interior reported to your committee on S. 164 and S. 405, both of which are bills to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. In paragraph 4 on the first page of that report we called attention to the fact that both bills are limited to the 17 Western States and that our recommendation was for a program that, subject to congressional consideration as individual proposals came along, would be nationwide. A similar report was sent to the House committee in connection with H. R. 104 and H. R. 384, which were companion bills to those introduced in the Senate. In its final action upon these proposals the House has enacted H. R. 5881, which is now before your committee. This bill was enlarged so that without limitation it applied to all 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

We intended only that the language would be such that the provisions of the bill would follow the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation as it might subsequently be given specific responsibilities beyond the 17 Western States. The language of the bill in this respect goes entirely beyond the scope of what was intended in the Department of the Interior's report on the bill. Such an expansion of these activities at this time appears premature. The framework of reclamation law has been adapted to the conditions found in the semiarid portions of the United States. The reclamation program has been readily adaptable to the system of water rights generally applicable in the Western States. However, there are many basic differences between laws affecting water rights in the nonreclamation States, and it will require considerable study before firm recommendations for a program of this kind in these other States can be developed.

We recommend that H. R. 5881 as it passed the House be limited to those States in which reclamation law is applicable and not include a blanket coverage of all 48 States.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington 25, D. C., June 3, 1955.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to Mr. French's letters of January 17 and 18, 1955, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 164 and

S. 405, similar bills to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

These two bills would supplement the present authority of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation by authorizing interest-free loans to finance construction of reclamation projects in the 17 Western States by non-Federal organizations. The benefits of the loan authority would extend only to projects or units or features of projects having an estimated cost of not more than \$5 million, and not to exceed \$100 million would be authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the bills. The legislation, therefore, would provide the Department of the Interior with additional authority to encourage non-Federal organizations to construct relatively small reclamation projects.

In its letter to you of March 17, 1955, a copy of which was sent to the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Interior stated that, because its report was being submitted prior to clearance with the Bureau of the Budget, no commitment could be made concerning the relation of the two bills or of Interior's views on them to the program of the President. In that letter, Interior indicated that the draft legislation which the Department had proposed last year as a substitute for H. R. 5301 of the 83d Congress differed in certain respects from the two subject bills. The Department recommended that, with appropriate amendments, S. 164 or S. 405 be enacted.

In our letter of April 9, 1954, to the Secretary of the Interior regarding H. R. 5301, 83d Congress, and the draft substitute bill proposed at that time by the Department, the Bureau of the Budget stated:

"Inasmuch as the draft bill provides for following authorization procedures and engineering design standards comparable to those used under existing reclamation law, it is doubtful that many small irrigation projects could make use of the provisions of the bill. In line with the policy of the administration, suitable draft legislation should be developed to make it possible for State and local groups, with Federal assistance, to undertake financially sound small irrigation projects. Such legislation should be consistent with sound water-resources development. It should be directed to the development of small projects, on the basis of simplified design standards, to provide needed water supply for limited agricultural areas whose needs cannot be met under the water facilities program of the Department of Agriculture, or under existing reclamation law as supplemented by the Department's proposed bill. The exact form of Federal assistance for small irrigation projects should be fully explored with the objective of shifting the major responsibility for financing to State and local interests.

"While there would be no objection to the submission of your proposed report and substitute draft bill to the committee, the proposal does not fully accomplish the objectives of the administration, as outlined above, to broaden the responsibilities for financing the reclamation program and to encourage small reclamation development."

Since H. R. 5301 and the draft substitute of the Department of the Interior were reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget in April 1954, several actions have been taken which require that our position on this legislation be reexamined. The Water Facilities Act has been made applicable to the 48 States and to the Territories and possessions, the purposes of that act have been substantially broadened, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act was enacted, and the President has established an Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy to review water resources policy and to prepare legislative recommendations. In view of these developments several features of this legislation have been restudied and will be discussed below.

S. 164 and S. 405, as well as the Interior draft substitute for H. R. 5301, permit interest-free loans for reclamation purposes. On the other hand, it has always been the policy under the authority of the Water Facilities Act, as broadened last year to apply to the 48 States and to the Territories and possessions, to require payment of interest on loans. The difference automatically raises a fundamental issue of policy which is being considered by the Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy. The Bureau of the Budget has no recommendation at this time with regard to this policy matter.

A second policy question concerns the geographical coverage of reclamation loan authority legislation. The draft bill submitted by the Department as a substitute for H. R. 5301 and the Department's letter of transmittal made no mention of the geographical area to which the loan program would apply. The question of broadening the geographical area to be covered by the Reclamation Act or by related loan authority is one of the policy questions being considered by the Advisory

Committee on Water Resources Policy. Pending completion of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee as they may affect reclamation authority of the Department of the Interior and related authorities of other Federal agencies, the Bureau of the Budget believes that any new reclamation loan authority should be confined to the 17 Western States to which the Reclamation Act now applies. The question of the desirability of providing reclamation loan authority in the Eastern States should be considered in relation to basic policy on reclamation and related authorities of the Department of Agriculture under the Water Facilities Act and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

Another policy question concerns the provision in both S. 164 and S. 405 for a limitation of 25 percent of the reimbursable costs of a project which may be required to be contributed by an applicant organization. The Department of the Interior, in its letter to the committee of March 17, 1955, recommended that the subject bills be amended to remove the limitation of 25 percent as the proportion of local contributions that the Secretary of the Interior may require. This recommendation would be in line with the general principle that greater responsibility should be borne by State and local interests and would give greater flexibility in the administration of a loan program. The Bureau of the Budget agrees with this recommendation.

Still another policy issue is raised by the question of whether or not each project or loan contract should be authorized or approved by specific action of the Congress. Again, this is a matter being considered by the Presidential Advisory Committee. S. 164 provides that loan contracts involving projects costing more than \$200,000 may not be executed until the project proposal and the contract have been approved by act of Congress. S. 405, on the other hand, permits execution of loan contracts for all projects (within a \$5 million limit) after a period of 60 days during which the proposal is required to lie before the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives or, if the Congress is not in session, the chairman and ranking minority member of each such committee. The Bureau of the Budget believes that, as a general principle, relatively small projects should not require specific congressional authorization as long as basic legislation provides adequate standards and safeguards for determining the soundness of Federal investments or other financial contributions.

Neither bill incorporates the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation law. If the loans are to be interest free and confined to the 17 Western States it would seem appropriate that any legislation providing an exception to the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation law be considered on an overall policy basis rather than in connection with piecemeal legislation dealing only with loan financing of small reclamation projects.

The Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to enactment of legislation authorizing Federal loans to finance construction of small reclamation projects by non-Federal organizations if limited to the 17 Western States. It must be recognized, however, that when the Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy has made its report to the President certain additional legislative recommendations may be made with respect to most of the policy issues raised above.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD R. BELCHER, *Assistant Director.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1955.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,

*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: A report has been requested from this Department on S. 164 and S. 405, similar bills to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

These two bills would supplement the present authority of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation by authorizing interest-free loans to finance construction of reclamation projects in the 17 Western States by non-Federal organizations. The benefits of the loan authority would extend only to projects or units or features of projects having an estimated cost of not more than \$5 million, and not to exceed \$100 million would be authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the bills. The legislation, therefore, would provide

the Department of the Interior with additional authority to encourage non-Federal organizations to construct relatively small reclamation projects.

This Department is in accord with the principal objectives of the proposed bills. It is recognized that it may be desirable to develop and improve irrigation projects in the West that are larger in size than can be developed and improved with authority available to this Department. It appears to this Department that the development of such projects under the proposed legislation will create problems associated with the administration of certain existing legislation, specifically the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act and the Water Facilities Act, which would require further study prior to definitive legislation as indicated in the letter from the Bureau of the Budget.

It is my understanding that the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy is reviewing the Federal water resources policy. Pending completion of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee as they may affect the basic policy of the Department of Agriculture under the Water Facilities Act and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, we believe that any new authority under the reclamation law should be confined to the 17 Western States.

The remaining provisions of the proposed bills raise matters of policy outside the province of this Department and, therefore, we interpose no comment with respect thereto. The Bureau of the Budget advises us that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. PETERSON, *Assistant Secretary.*

SEPARATE CONCURRING VIEWS OF SENATOR RICHARD
L. NEUBERGER ON S. 2442

Although I have supported this bill in committee, I would be remiss if I did not express the hope that it will be amended on the Senate floor to include a provision making all projects under the bill subject to the 160-acre limitation.

This is a restriction on the size of irrigated farms on Federal reclamation projects. It has existed since the administration of Theodore Roosevelt. Its basic purpose is to protect the family-sized farm, to make sure that land reclaimed with Federal funds is not exploited by corporation farming and by farms of inordinately large size.

It is my opinion that the general purpose of this bill is commendable. However, I think that any reclamation projects authorized under the bill should be subject both to the 160-acre limitation and to the public-power preference clause, which assures to nonprofit public agencies first call and priority on any water power generated at Federal reclamation projects.

Without these fundamental protections, we are in danger of letting monopolies in the field of power production and corporations in the realm of agriculture, become the main beneficiaries of this legislation.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator from Oregon.

Calendar No. 1085

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2442

[Report No. 1073]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 11, 1955

Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. LONG, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. HILL) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

JULY 21, 1955

Reported by Mr. ANDERSON, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I

4 SECTION 1. The purpose of this title is to encourage
5 State and local participation in the development of projects
6 under the Federal reclamation laws and to provide for
7 Federal assistance in the development of similar projects in
8 the seventeen western reclamation States by non-Federal
9 organizations.

1 SEC. 2. As used in this title—

2 (a) The term “construction”, in addition to its usual
3 meaning under the Federal reclamation laws, shall include
4 rehabilitation and betterment.

5 (b) The term “Federal reclamation laws” shall mean
6 the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amend-
7 atory thereof or supplementary thereto.

8 (c) The term “organization” shall mean a State or a
9 department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a
10 conservancy district, irrigation district, water users’ associa-
11 tion, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar
12 organization which has capacity to contract with the United
13 States under the Federal reclamation laws.

14 (d) The term “project” shall mean (i) any complete
15 reclamation or irrigation undertaking or a complete, self-
16 contained, and distinct enterprise which may be a unit of such
17 a larger undertaking, or a rehabilitation and betterment
18 program for an existing irrigation project, authorized to be
19 constructed pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws, and
20 (ii) any similar undertaking proposal to be constructed by
21 an organization. The term “project” shall not include any
22 such undertaking, unit or program the cost of which exceeds
23 \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this defini-
24 tion shall preclude the making of a grant not in excess of
25 \$5,000,000 in accordance with the provisions of sections

1 4 and 5 of this title, to organizations which qualify for the
2 same and which are not applicants for a loan under this
3 title: *And provided further*, That an organization shall be
4 limited to a contract or contracts under the provisions of
5 this title provided the total of the costs involved does not
6 exceed \$5,000,000, except as otherwise herein provided.

7 (e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary
8 of the Interior.

9 SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the
10 benefits provided in this title shall submit a proposal therefor
11 to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall pre-
12 scribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a pay-
13 ment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining
14 the proposal.

15 SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construc-
16 tion of a project which has not theretofore been authorized
17 for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set
18 forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail
19 comparable to those included in preauthorization reports re-
20 quired for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been
21 submitted for review by the States of the stream basin in
22 which the project is located in like manner as provided in
23 subsection (c), section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944
24 (58 Stat. 887), except that the review may be limited to the
25 State or States in which the project is located if the proposal

1 is one solely for rehabilitation and betterment of an existing
2 project, and shall include a proposed allocation of cap-
3 ital costs to functions such that costs for facilities used
4 for a single purpose shall be allocated to that purpose and
5 costs for facilities used for more than one purpose shall be
6 so allocated among the purposes served that each purpose
7 will share equitably in the costs of such joint facilities.

8 (b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that
9 the organization already holds or can acquire all lands
10 and interests in land (except public and other lands and
11 interests in land owned by the United States which are
12 within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and
13 subject to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water
14 necessary for the successful construction, operation, and
15 maintenance of the project and that (*except in the case of*
16 *rehabilitation and betterment projects*) it is ready, able, and
17 willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this
18 title such portion of the cost of construction (which portion
19 shall include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and
20 rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have
21 advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided*, That the
22 contribution required of any applicant organization shall not
23 be in excess of 25 per centum of the costs of the project
24 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation
25 project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable func-

1 tions under general provisions of law applicable to such proj-
2 ects and, ~~in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects,~~
3 ~~any existing~~ irrigation facilities owned by the applicant or-
4 ganization ~~may~~ *shall* be pledged as all or part of any contribu-
5 tions ~~so required~~ *security for repayment*.

6 (c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the
7 Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appro-
8 priate State agency designated by him) to be financially
9 feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the
10 requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the
11 provisions of this title, the Secretary is hereby authorized to
12 negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as pro-
13 vided in section 5: *Provided*, That if any affected State
14 shall object, pursuant to opportunity therefor afforded under
15 the terms of the Act of December 22, 1944 (the Flood
16 Control Act of 1944), or if the estimated cost of any project
17 is in excess of \$500,000, no such contract shall be executed
18 until and unless the same shall have been approved by
19 Act of Congress, except as hereinbefore provided for re-
20 habilitation and betterment of an existing project: *Provided*
21 *further*, That prior to submission of any project proposal the
22 Secretary shall afford the applicant organization an oppor-
23 tunity to comment in writing on the conclusions and recom-
24 mendations of the Secretary with respect to the project
25 proposal and such written comment of the applicant organ-

1 ization shall be included in the matter submitted to the
2 Congress. The Secretary at the time of submitting the
3 project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determi-
4 nation that the requested project constitutes a reasonable
5 risk under the provisions of this title, may reserve from use
6 or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests
7 in land owned by the United States which are within his
8 administrative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him
9 and which are required for use by the project. Any such
10 reservation shall expire at the end of two years unless the
11 repayment contract provided for in section 5 of this title shall
12 have been executed.

13 (d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to
14 financial feasibility, emergency or urgent need for the project,
15 whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irriga-
16 tion water for an existing irrigation project, whether the pro-
17 posal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project
18 works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irri-
19 gation or drainage. All project works and facilities con-
20 structed under this title shall remain under the ownership
21 and control of the local contracting organization subject to
22 the terms of the contract entered into pursuant to section 5
23 of this title.

24 SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under

1 the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this title shall
2 set out, among other things—

3 (a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made
4 to the organization and the time and method of making
5 the same available to the organization. Said loan shall
6 not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project
7 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal recla-
8 mation project, would be properly allocable to reim-
9 bursable functions under general provisions of law
10 applicable to such projects;

11 (b) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded
12 the organization and the time and method of paying the
13 same to the organization. Said grant shall not exceed that
14 portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project
15 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation
16 project, would be properly allocable to nonreimbursable
17 functions under general provisions of law applicable to such
18 projects;

19 (c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1)
20 the sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the
21 date when the principal benefits of the project first become
22 available; and (2) interest, as determined by the Secretary
23 of the Treasury, by estimating the average annual yield
24 to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quota-

1 tions or prices during the month of May preceding the
2 fiscal year in which the loan is made, on all outstanding
3 marketable obligations of the United States having a matu-
4 rity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of such
5 month of May, and by adjusting such estimated average
6 annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum
7 at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on
8 which the contract is executed on that pro rata share of
9 the loan which is attributable to furnishing irrigation benefits
10 in each particular year to land held in private ownership
11 by any one owner in excess of one hundred and sixty ir-
12 rigable acres; and (3) in the case of any project involving
13 an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water sup-
14 ply, or commercial power produced as an element of the
15 project and incidental to its full development, interest on
16 the unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the
17 loan at a rate as determined in (2) above;

18 (d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant
19 predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable
20 functions is made, in accordance with regulations with
21 respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal
22 department or agency primarily concerned with those
23 functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such
24 regulations, for operation by the United States or for

1 repayment to the United States of the amount of any
2 such grant; and

3 (e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem
4 necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security
5 for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as afore-
6 said. The liability of the United States under any con-
7 tract entered into pursuant to this title shall be contin-
8 gent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out
9 the same, and every such contract shall so recite.

10 SEC. 6. Upon request of an organization which has
11 made or intends to make a proposal under this title the
12 head of any Federal department or agency may make avail-
13 able to the organization any existing engineering, economic,
14 or hydrologic information and printed material that it may
15 have and that will be useful in connection with the planning,
16 design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the
17 project concerned. As agreed upon, the reasonable cost
18 of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material
19 furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and
20 the reasonable cost of making and administering any loan
21 under this title shall, to the extent that they would not be
22 nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under
23 the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and cov-
24 ered in the provisions of the contract entered into under sec-

1 tion 5 of this title unless they are otherwise paid for by the
2 organization.

3 SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform any
4 and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be
5 necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this title

6 SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
7 such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,000,-
8 000 to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That
9 the Secretary shall advise the Congress promptly on the
10 receipt of each proposal referred to in section 3 and, previous
11 to any appropriation, shall have reported to the Congress
12 on each proposal that has his approval, but no contracts
13 shall be executed until the Congress shall have appropriated
14 funds for the specific proposal covered by each contract.
15 All appropriations authorized for the purposes of this title
16 shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as
17 they are used to finance loans made under this title, be
18 reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided.

19 SEC. 9. This title shall be a supplement to the Federal
20 reclamation laws.

21 TITLE II

22 SEC. 21. The purpose of this title is to encourage State
23 and local participation in the development of non-Federal
24 projects similar to those described in title I and to provide
25 for Federal assistance to non-Federal organizations under

1 terms and conditions, so far as found practicable by the Sec-
2 retary, as described in said title I in the thirty-one States
3 (outside of the seventeen western reclamation States) and
4 in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

5 SEC. 22. As used in this title—

6 (a) The term “construction”, in addition to its usual
7 meaning under the Federal reclamation laws, shall include
8 rehabilitation and betterment, drainage and control of saline
9 water intrusion.

10 (b) The term “Federal reclamation laws” shall mean
11 the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amend-
12 atory thereof or supplementary thereto.

13 (c) The term “organization” shall mean a State or a
14 department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a
15 conservancy district, irrigation district, drainage district,
16 water users’ association, an agency created by interstate com-
17 pact, or similar organization which has capacity to contract
18 with the United States.

19 (d) The term “project” shall mean (i) any complete
20 reclamation, drainage, water storage, saline water intrusion
21 control, or irrigation undertaking or a complete, self-con-
22 tained, and distinct enterprise which may be a unit of such
23 a larger undertaking, or a rehabilitation and betterment
24 program for an existing irrigation project, and (ii) any
25 similar undertaking proposed to be constructed by an organ-

1 ization. The term "project" shall not include any such
2 undertaking, unit, or program the cost of which exceeds
3 \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this defi-
4 nition shall preclude the making of a grant not in excess of
5 \$5,000,000 in accordance with the provisions of sections 24
6 and 25 of this title, to organizations which qualify for the
7 same and which are not applicants for a loan under this
8 title: *And provided further*, That an organization shall be
9 limited to a contract or contracts under the provisions of
10 this title provided the total of the costs involved does not
11 exceed \$5,000,000, except as otherwise herein provided.

12 (e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of
13 Agriculture.

14 SEC. 23. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the
15 benefits provided in this title shall submit a proposal therefor
16 to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall pre-
17 scribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a pay-
18 ment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining
19 the proposal.

20 SEC. 24. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construc-
21 tion of a project shall set forth, among other things, a plan
22 and estimated cost in detail and any other information re-
23 quired by the Secretary; shall have been submitted for review
24 by any States likely to be materially affected by the project.

25 (b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that

1 the organization already holds or can acquire all lands
2 and interests in land (except public and other lands and
3 interests in land owned by the United States which are
4 within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and
5 subject to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water
6 necessary for the successful construction, operation, and
7 maintenance of the project and that (*except in the case of*
8 *rehabilitation and betterment projects*) it is ready, able, and
9 willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this
10 title such portion of the cost of construction (which portion
11 shall include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and
12 rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have
13 advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided*, That the
14 contribution required of any applicant organization shall not
15 be in excess of 25 per centum of the costs of the project
16 which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation
17 project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable func-
18 tions under general provisions of law applicable to such proj-
19 ects and, ~~in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects,~~
20 ~~any existing~~ irrigation or other facilities owned by the appli-
21 cant organization, as well as other assets or income of the
22 applicant organization, may be pledged as all or part of any
23 ~~contribution so required~~ security for repayment.

24 (c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the
25 Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appro-

1 priate State agency designated by him) to be financially
2 feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the
3 requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the
4 provisions of this title, the Secretary is hereby authorized to
5 negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as pro-
6 vided in section 25: *Provided*, That if any affected State
7 shall object, or if the estimated cost of any project is
8 in excess of \$500,000, no such contract shall be executed
9 until and unless the same shall have been approved by
10 Act of Congress, ~~except as hereinbefore provided for re-~~
11 ~~habilitation and betterment of any existing project~~: *Provided*
12 *further*, That prior to submission of any project proposal
13 the Secretary shall afford the applicant organization an
14 opportunity to comment in writing on the conclusions and
15 recommendations of the Secretary with respect to the project
16 proposal and such written comment of the applicant organ-
17 ization shall be included in the matter submitted to the
18 Congress. The Secretary at the time of submitting the
19 project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determina-
20 tion that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk
21 under the provisions of this title, may reserve from use or
22 disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests
23 in land owned by the United States which are within his
24 administrative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him
25 and which are required for use by the project. Any such

1 reservation shall expire at the end of two years unless the
2 repayment contract provided for in section 25 of this title
3 shall have been executed.

4 (d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to
5 financial feasibility, emergency, or urgent need for the project,
6 whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irriga-
7 tion water for an existing irrigation project, whether drain-
8 age benefits are involved, whether the proposal involves
9 rehabilitation of existing irrigation project works, and
10 whether the proposed project is primarily for irrigation or
11 drainage. All project works and facilities constructed under
12 this title shall remain under the ownership and control of
13 the local contracting organization subject to the terms of the
14 contract entered into pursuant to section 25 of this title.

15 SEC. 25. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under
16 the provisions of subsection (c) of section 24 of this title
17 shall set out, among other things—

18 (a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made
19 to the organization and the time and method of making
20 the same available to the organization. Said loan shall
21 not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project.

22 (b) the maximum amount of any grant to be
23 accorded the organization and the time and method of
24 paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall
25 not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of con-

1 structing the project which, if it were being constructed
2 as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly
3 allocable to nonreimbursable functions under general
4 provisions of law applicable to such projects;

5 (c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1)
6 the sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the
7 date when the principal benefits of the project first be-
8 come available; and (2) interest, at the average rate, as
9 determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, paid on the
10 long-term interest-bearing marketable securities of the
11 United States outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal
12 year preceding the date on which the contract is executed
13 on that pro rata share of the loan which is attributable to
14 furnishing domestic, industrial, or municipal water sup-
15 ply, or commercial power produced as an element of the
16 project and incidental to its full development;

17 (d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant
18 predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable
19 functions is made, in accordance with regulations with
20 respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal
21 department or agency primarily concerned with those
22 functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such
23 regulations, for operation by the United States or for
24 repayment to the United States of the amount of any
25 such grant; and

(e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as aforesaid. The liability of the United States under any contract entered into pursuant to this title shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the same, and every such contract shall so recite.

SEC. 26. Upon request of an organization which has made or intends to make a proposal under this title, the head of any Federal department or agency may make available to the organization any existing engineering, economic, or hydrologic information and printed material that it may have and that will be useful in connection with the planning, design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the project concerned. As agreed upon, the reasonable cost of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the reasonable cost of making and administering any loan under this title shall, to the extent that they would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 25 of this title unless they are otherwise paid for by the organization.

SEC. 27. The Secretary is authorized to perform any

1 and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may
2 be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of
3 this title, and shall report the same to Congress currently.

4 SEC. 28. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
5 such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,000,-
6 000 to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That
7 the Secretary shall advise the Congress promptly on the
8 receipt of each proposal referred to in section 23 and, previous
9 to any appropriation, shall have reported to the Congress
10 on each proposal that has his approval, but no contracts
11 shall be executed until the Congress shall have appropriated
12 funds for the specific proposal covered by each contract.
13 All appropriations authorized for the purposes of this title
14 shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as
15 they are used to finance loans made under this title, be
16 reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided.

17 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

18 SEC. 31. The planning and construction of projects
19 undertaken pursuant to this Act shall be subject to all pro-
20 cedural requirements and other provisions of the Act of
21 August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), except in the case of
22 projects solely for rehabilitation and betterment.

23 SEC. 32. If any provision of this Act or the applica-
24 tion of such provision to any person, organization, or circum-
25 stance shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and

1 the application of such provision to persons, organizations,
2 or circumstances other than those as to which it is held
3 invalid shall not be affected thereby.

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2442

[Report No. 1073]

A BILL

To provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. LONG, Mr. BARRETT, Mr.
BIBLE, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. HILL

JULY 11, 1955

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior
and Insular Affairs

JULY 21, 1955

Reported with amendments

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 26, 1955
For actions of July 25, 1955
84th-1st, No. 125

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....1	Forestry.....38,40,41	Roads.....22,34
Appropriations.....5,16,39,43	Immigration.....21	Security.....10
CCC.....11,36	Labor, farm.....15	Small business.....20
Commodity exchanges.....18	Mining.....31,40	St. Lawrence Seaway.....7
Customs.....21	Personnel.....24,27	Sugar.....12
Dairy industry.....35	Reclamation.....3,19,23,25,31	Tobacco.....13,30
Disaster relief.....11	Regulatory agencies.....8	Transportation.....9
Education.....42	Reorganization.....33	Veterans' benefits.....28,42
Electrification.....6,19,26,31	Research.....30	Water, compact.....2
Family farms.....37	Reserve forces.....17	resources.....4,29
Foreign aid.....16,32,43	Rice.....1,14	Wheat.....6
Foreign trade.....21		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed bill to amend rice quota law. Senate made supplemental appropriation bill its unfinished business. House committee reported bills to amend the Sugar Act, tobacco allotments-quotas law, and rice quota law.

SENATE

1. RICE. Passed without amendment S. 2573, to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to provide that in States where farm rice acreage allotments are established on a producer basis only the past plantings of rice by the producer within the State and acreage allotments previously established in the State for the producers would be used in determining such allotments (p. 9785).
2. RIVER COMPACT. Passed as reported S. 730, to authorize a water compact between Kans. and Okla. for the waters of the Ark. River and its tributaries as they affect such States (p. 9777).
3. RECLAMATION. Passed over, upon requests of Sens. Ervin and Ellender, S. 2442, to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects (p. 9779).
Passed as reported S. 926, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, Calif., and S. 1194, to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., as a unit of the Mo. River Basin project (pp. 9797-9801).

4. WATER RESOURCES. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 3990, to authorize the Interior Department to investigate and report to Congress on the water resources in Alaska (pp. 9784-5).
5. APPROPRIATIONS. Made its unfinished business H. R. 7278, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1956 (p. 9803).
6. ELECTRIFICATION; WHEAT. Sen. Neuberger inserted Oregon Grange resolutions urging the return of certain hi-lines to the Bonneville Power Administration and favoring a two-price plan for wheat (p. 9763).
7. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Sen. Wiley announced that S. Doc 165, the manual on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, has been released. He stated that the document contains a complete history of the seaway, a description of all of its economic, engineering, power, maintenance, legal, and other ramifications (pp. 9769-72).
8. REGULATORY AGENCIES. Sen. Sparkman expressed concern over "the growing practice of the executive branch of the Government to usurp the power of the legislative branch of the Government through perversion of the regulatory agencies" (pp. 9787-8).
9. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Butler inserted a Maryland Farm News article, "Baltimore: the Port That Helped Agriculture," outlining reasons for Baltimore's importance in the development of agricultural trade, with special reference to the ability of the grain "mixers" (p. 9790).
10. GOVERNMENT SECURITY. Sen. Wiley announced that S. Doc. 40, the revised edition of the Internal Security Manual, has been released, and inserted Scott McLeod's letter commending this publication, with particular reference to Parts III and IV which relate especially to employee security programs (p. 9659, July 22).

HOUSE

11. COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION. Received a draft of proposed legislation from the USDA, to increase the borrowing power of the CCC from \$10 to \$12 billion; referred to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 9862). Bills have been introduced in both Houses to execute the provisions of this proposal.
Conferees were appointed on H. R. 2851, to make agricultural commodities owned by the CCC available to persons in need in areas of acute distress (p. 9850). Senate conferees have not yet been appointed.
12. SUGAR. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7030, to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948 (H. Rept. 1348) (p. 9863).
13. TOBACCO. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 6846, to provide for tobacco allotments on farms with no previously established quota (H. Rept. 1358); and reported without amendment H. R. 6847, to provide for the establishment of burley tobacco allotments (H. Rept. 1359), and H. R. 6845, to establish national marketing quotas for tobacco (H. Rept. 1360) (p. 9863).
14. RICE. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7302, to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (H. Rept. 1361) (p. 9863).

for, to install additional pump capacity in the Yuma Mesa Pump Plant of not to exceed 275 cubic feet per second, to construct such buildings determined by him to be appropriate in connection with the operation and maintenance of the lands situate within the district, and to provide in the contract referred to in section 1 hereof for the performance of such work.

SEC. 3. Expenditures by the United States in excess of the amounts to be repaid by the district as provided in section 1 hereof, which have been allocated by the Secretary (a) to acreage eliminated from the Gila project pursuant to the act of July 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 628), (b) to dust control on the Yuma Mesa Division, Gila project, (c) to that portion of predevelopment costs not heretofore covered by contracts and mortgages covering predevelopment charges on land situate within the district, and (d) other costs allocated by the Secretary to the lands situate within the district not otherwise covered by the repayment obligation in section 1 hereof to be assumed by the district or not otherwise allocated by the Secretary to other contracting entities and which are assumed or are to be assumed by them, shall be nonreimbursable: *Provided*, That all revenues from the disposal of public lands within the district, which disposition is hereby authorized on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary, or from special water service contracts other than those which the Secretary determines are allocable to operation and maintenance costs of the district shall be retained by the United States.

SEC. 4. The authority granted in section 1 of this act to execute said contract shall terminate on December 31, 1957.

SEC. 5. This act is declared to be a part of the Federal reclamation laws as they are defined in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187).

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2442) to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, because of a request made of me, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2603) to authorize the providing of family housing for the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN CAVEN POINT TERMINAL, NEW JERSEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1261) to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within Caven Point terminal and ammunition loading pier, New Jersey, to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, on page 4, line 13, after the word "Authority", to insert "its suc-

cessors, contractors, lessees, or assigns", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, a body corporate and politic organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New Jersey, for street or road purposes and other purposes connected therewith or related thereto, including restaurants, gasoline stations, rest rooms, parking areas, maintenance shops, and storage areas for maintenance equipment, whether operated by the New Jersey Turnpike Authority or others, all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as otherwise reserved in this act, in and to a certain parcel of land within Caven Point Terminal and Ammunition Loading Pier, New Jersey, situated in the city of Jersey City, county of Hudson, and State of New Jersey, and more particularly described as follows:

Parcel R-30A-2 as designated on a map filed or about to be filed in the Office of the Register of Deeds of said county, entitled: "New Jersey Turnpike Authority, New Jersey Turnpike, Newark Bay-Hudson County Extension, Parcel Property Map."

Said Parcel R-30A-2 including specifically all the land and premises lying within the proposed lines of the New Jersey Turnpike, Newark Bay-Hudson County extension, and described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the division line of lands now or formerly of the United States Army, and lands now or formerly of Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., said point being a point common to lots 1B and 1A; thence (1) north 37 degrees 13 minutes 52 seconds east continuing along last-mentioned division line 495.43 feet to a point; thence (2) north 79 degrees 24 minutes 23 seconds east continuing along aforesaid last-mentioned division line 440.75 feet to an angle point in said division line; thence (3) north 71 degrees 17 minutes 52 seconds east, continuing along said division line 444.40 feet to a point in the northwesterly boundary of lands now or formerly of Tankport Terminals, Inc.; thence (4) southerly along the division line between lands of the United States Army, and lands now or formerly of Tankport Terminals, Inc., said division line being a curve to the left having a radius of 441.68 feet, an arc distance of 384.72 feet to a point; thence (5) running along the proposed right-of-way line of the Newark Bay-Hudson County Extension of the New Jersey Turnpike, the following courses and distances, said right-of-way line being a curve to the left having a radius of 374.27 feet, an arc distance of 120.27 feet to a point; thence (6) south 21 degrees 13 minutes 47 seconds west, a distance of 134.93 feet to a point; thence (7) following a curve to the right having a radius of 531.44 feet, an arc distance of 578.18 feet to a point; thence (8) south 83 degrees 33 minutes 52 seconds west, distant 136.69 feet to a point; thence (9) along the arc of a curve to the left having a radius of 493.34 feet, an arc distance of 54.39 feet to a point in the line dividing lot 4C and lot 1A; thence (10) north 33 degrees 13 minutes 08 seconds west, a distance of 273.59 feet to the point of beginning, containing 396,913.0 square feet more or less, or 9.11 acres more or less, being also designated as part of lots 1A, 1D, 2, 3C in block 1500, and part of lot 1D in block 1494 on the tax map of the city of Jersey City, together with any and all right of direct access to and from the aforementioned extension of the New Jersey Turnpike constructed or to be constructed on land hereinabove described.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall be made subject to (a) the condition that the New Jersey Turnpike Author-

ity pay into the Treasury of the United States, in return for the land conveyed, an amount equal to the fair market value of such land to be determined by the Secretary of the Army after appraisal of such land, and (b) such other conditions, limitations, or reservations as the Secretary may deem necessary to assure that the use of such land by the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, its successors, contractors, lessees, or assigns, shall not interfere with the operation of the aforementioned installation and to assure that the interest of the United States shall be protected.

SEC. 3. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be reserved to the United States.

SEC. 4. There shall be further reserved to the United States in the conveyance of the above-described lands, rights-of-way for water lines, sewer lines, telephone and telegraph lines, power lines, and such other utilities which may now exist or which may become necessary to the operation of the Caven Point Terminal and Ammunition Loading Pier. Any such utility crossings required by the United States subsequent to the opening of the Newark Bay-Hudson County extension of the New Jersey Turnpike to traffic, shall be installed underground and at the expense of the United States.

SEC. 5. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations contained in sections 3 and 4 of this act.

SEC. 6. In the event actual construction of such street or road and other construction connected therewith or related thereto is not commenced within 2 years from the date of enactment of this act, or in the event such property shall cease to be used for street or road purposes and other purposes connected therewith or related thereto for a period of 2 consecutive years, then title to such land, including all improvements made by the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, shall immediately revert to the United States without any payment by the United States of compensation therefor.

SEC. 7. The provisions of section 601 of the act of Congress approved September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, 82d Cong.), shall not apply to the conveyance authorized by this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH and Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for the form in which the bill appears. It provides for the reservation of all mineral rights and for payment on the basis of appraisal according to the fair market value. I think it is a sound bill.

ADJUSTMENTS IN THE DATES OF RANK OF NURSES OF THE REGULAR ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The bill (H. R. 2150) to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CREDIT FOR PRIOR ACTIVE SERVICE PERFORMED BY CERTAIN COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

The bill (H. R. 4106) to authorize the crediting for certain purposes of prior active Federal commissioned service performed by a person appointed as a commissioned officer under section 101 or 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOAN OF CERTAIN ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE EQUIPMENT TO THE GIRL SCOUTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 4218) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and to provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the Girl Scout Senior Roundup Encampment, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELEASE OF EXPRESS CONDITION AND LIMITATION ON CERTAIN LAND CONVEYED TO THE VILLAGE OF SAG HARBOR, N. Y.

The bill (H. R. 4717) to provide for the release of the express condition and limitation on certain land heretofore conveyed to the trustees of the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a problem or two in connection with this bill which I should like to have cleared up before I consent to its passage.

I understand that in 1926 the United States conveyed to the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y., a tract of 2,988 square feet for \$150, subject to a reversion to the grantor in the event the tract should cease to be used for park purposes.

The village erected a fence on what it thought was the west boundary of the property. In fact, the fence was 13 feet east of the west boundary. A private owner then erected a two-story building at the fence boundary, assuming it to be correct.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Army to release by quitclaim deed the public-use condition with respect to 650 square feet of the original 2,988 square feet, which is 1.5 percent of an acre. There is no provision for payment of consideration.

I realize that the committee report points out that it is a de minimus matter and recommends that the interest be given up. However, the report states that the Morse formula is not applied here. It must be on the basis of de minimus. Is that the only theory involved?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I would state that that is the reason the committee approved the bill. It would cost more to have an appraisal to determine the market value than the market value itself would seem to be.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I wish to bring out, in order that it may be perfectly clear for the Record. If I insist upon 50 percent of the appraised fair market value for this property, I will be insisting upon something which the committee can assure me would cost more, by way of appraisal, than 100 percent of the property would be worth.

Mr. ERVIN. That is the reason why the committee reconsidered the question of whether it should amend the bill to require payment of the fair market value. We were satisfied that the appraisal would cost more than the Government could realize from the property.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish the Record to be perfectly clear. I have never made any exception to the application of the Morse formula, which requires the payment of 50 percent of the appraised fair market value of a piece of property sought to be transferred, because I have never had presented before a case in which 50 percent of the appraised fair market value would not be at least one copper over and above the cost of having an appraisal. The whole purpose of the Morse formula is to save money for the taxpayers. The purpose is not to cost the taxpayers anything.

The committee presents to me a situation in which only a few square feet of land are involved, and the Government has a reversionary interest in that—

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that Sag Harbor Village paid \$150 for the whole tract in 1926, and the purpose of the bill is to relieve the cloud with reference to a portion of the land which has not even a nominal value.

Mr. MORSE. It is not a transfer of any property other than a reversionary interest to a few square feet of property which in and of itself constitutes a cloud on the title. Sag Harbor originally paid \$150 for these few square feet of property. If we insisted upon the application of the Morse formula, it would cost more to appoint an appraiser and pay his expenses than could possibly be obtained by way of a return from the property.

With that explanation, Mr. President, and since, in my judgment, the bill, therefore, does not violate the Morse formula, because its purpose is to save money for the taxpayers and not to cost them money, I raise no objection to the bill.

I also wish to commend the committee on the fact that they show by their report their recognition of the soundness of the principle of the Morse formula. If the situation were not such that it would cost more to collect than the value which would be received, it would be perfectly clear that the Morse formula would be applicable in this case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4717) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIGIBILITY FOR RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

The bill (H. R. 4886) to provide that active service in the Army and Air Force shall be included in determining the eligibility for retirement of certain commissioned officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

The bill (H. R. 6277) to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES TO ENLISTED PERSONNEL

The bill (H. R. 7194) to authorize subsistence allowances to enlisted personnel was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF COMMISSION POSTHUMOUSLY TO SEYMOUR RICHARD BELINKY

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 251) to authorize the President to issue posthumously to the late Seymour Richard Belinky, a flight officer in the United States Army, a commission as second lieutenant, United States Army, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2107) to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PORTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall object, without expressing in any way a personal opinion with reference to the bill, I feel that since the sum of \$250 million is involved, it is not properly consent-calendar business. Therefore, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY AND UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2109) to authorize permanent appointments in the United States Navy and in the United States Marine Corps, which had been reported from the Com-

7/28/55

14. MINERALS. Passed as reported H. R. 100, to permit the mining development and utilization of mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development (pp. 10193, 10216-7).
15. RECLAMATION; IRRIGATION. Passed with amendments H. R. 5881, to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. The amendments consisted of inserting the language of S. 2442 for that of the House bill. Senate conferees were appointed. (pp. 10207-15.)
Passed over, at the request of Sen. Bible, H. R. 4663, to authorize the construction of the Trinity River division, Central Valley project (p. 10194).
Passed as reported S. 1818, to limit the amount of land on Federal irrigation projects which may be exchanged under the act of August 13, 1953 (pp. 10194-5).
Sens. Morse and Neuberger inserted various articles and letters supporting the high dam project for the Hells Canyon Dam project (pp. 10206-7, 10221-3).
16. WATER COMPACTS. Passed without amendment H. R. 3587, authorizing the negotiation of compact by Calif. and Ariz. relative to the waters of the Klamath River (p. 10196).
17. FAO. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Ellender, S. J. Res. 97, to increase the limitation on the U. S. contribution to the Food and Agriculture Organization (p. 10196).
18. ROADS. Sen. Kuchel expressed his regret that Congress did not enact a Federal-aid highway construction bill this session.
19. WHEAT. Sen. Flanders suggested dropping bags of wheat on the Chinese mainland to alleviate the famine and influence the approaching diplomatic negotiations (pp. 10152-3).
20. EXPENDITURES. Sen. Payne commended the recent report on Government expenditures prepared by Sen. Byrd (pp. 10145-6).
21. HEALTH. Sen. Wiley inserted reports of the Public Health Service and private groups on the problem of health in the rural areas and efforts made to provide better health services (pp. 10153-6).
22. STRATEGIC MATERIALS. Sen. Malone submitted a report on the accessibility of strategic and critical materials to the United States in time of war and for our expanding economy. The report describes the economic structure of the 24 nations of the Western Hemisphere and the investment climate within those countries (S. Doc. 83) (p. 10183).
23. NOMINATIONS. Confirmed the nomination of Francis Wilcox as Assistant Secretary of State (pp. 10180-2).
24. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The Majority Leader scheduled for consideration Fri., July 29, the following measures: H. R. 6373, to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 (which was made the unfinished business); H. R. 4663, to authorize the construction of the Trinity River division, Central Valley Reclamation project; S. J. Res. 97, to increase U. S. contribution to the FAO; and S. 2402, to amend sec. 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930 (pp. 10221, 10195, 10219).

HOUSE

25. FARM-CITY WEEK. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendment H. J. Res. 317, designating the last week in October of each year as National Farm-City Week (H. Rept. 1551) (p. 10334).
26. CCC. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7541, to increase the borrowing power of the CCC from \$10 billion to \$12 billion (H. Rept. 1559) (p. 10334).
27. SUGAR. The Rules Committee reported a resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 7030, to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948 (p. 10325).
28. HOUSING. The Rules Committee reported a resolution providing for consideration of S. 2126, the housing bill (p. 10322).
29. FOREIGN AID. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7224, the mutual security appropriation bill for 1956, and acted on amendments in disagreement (pp. 10167-73, 10241-2). This bill will now be sent to the President.
30. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Both Houses received a Tariff Commission report on the operation of the trade agreements program, July 1953 to June 1954; to S. Finance and H. Ways and Means Committees (pp. 10137, 10334).
31. MINIMUM WAGE. Received the conference report on S. 2168, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to provide for an increase to \$1 in the minimum wage provisions (H. Rept. 1561) (pp. 10320-1).
32. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment H. R. 3255, to amend the Classification Act of 1949 so as to provide protection for Government officers and employees from loss of basic compensation resulting from reclassification of their positions (H. Rept. 1557) (p. 10334).
33. FARM INCOME. Rep. Deane discussed possibilities for increasing per capita farm income in N. C. and offered suggestions for agricultural development in that State (pp. 10328-32).
34. EMPLOYEE BONDING. Received the conference report on H. R. 4778, to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government (pp. 10322-5). The House conferees included the following in their statement:

"The conference substitute provides, in general, (1) for the mandatory purchase of surety bonds to cover civilian officers and employees and military personnel of each department and independent establishment in the executive branch ... who are required to be bonded by law or by administrative decision, and (2) for the discretionary purchase of surety bonds to cover those officers and employees in the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government with respect to whom the appropriate officials of the legislative and judicial branches deem it advisable to require the purchase of surety bonds.

"With respect to the executive branch, the conference substitute provides that the head of each department and independent establishment shall obtain and procure blanket, position schedule, or other types of surety bonds to cover those civilian officers and employees and military personnel of such department or establishment who are required, by law or administrative ruling to be bonded. It is required that such bonds shall be obtained and procured

River. This action, following the similar vote of the corresponding subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee, further refutes the unwarranted assumption of an examiner of the Federal Power Commission that the Congress would turn a deaf ear to any decision by this Commission to recommend Federal development of the Hell's Canyon site, which is the finest undeveloped power site still available in the country.

Today, we have additional evidence that the importance of full development of this magnificent damsite is rapidly gaining national recognition.

Mr. President, the New York Times is universally respected as one of the great newspapers of this Nation, and, indeed, of the entire world. It reaches its editorial positions slowly, thoughtfully, after careful deliberation. It is correspondingly influential. I am sure, for instance, that the Times' endorsement of the Republican ticket in the 1952 Presidential election carried a great deal of weight.

This morning, July 28, 1955, the New York Times editorially supports Federal construction of a high, multi-purpose Hell's Canyon dam. Speaking of the "enormously valuable water resource" of the Snake River, the Times concludes:

This is a natural resource that belongs to all the people. It seems clear that the maximum benefit from the resource in this case, in respect to power, irrigation, navigation and other facets of an integrated river program, can only be obtained by large-scale Federal investment.

This is the reason why my senior colleague and I, along with 28 other Senators from all parts of the country, have, under his fine leadership, sponsored and urged passage of the bill to authorize the Federal Hells Canyon project. If the present national administration would abandon its unyielding opposition to it, this great river project which is so plainly in the national interest, would very rapidly win the approval of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the New York Times of today, July 28, printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELLS CANYON

Hells Canyon, in the remote fastnesses of the Snake River on the Oregon-Idaho border, is one of the finest unexploited power sites in the country. For at least 8 years the dispute has raged over the question of how the great hydroelectric potential there should be developed, whether by public or private enterprise. The solution cannot be put off much longer.

Senator MORSE and a large number of other Senators have been sponsoring a bill authorizing Federal construction of a 600-foot dam at Hells Canyon to produce over 900,000 kilowatts of power, as one more giant addition to the integrated system of Federal dams in the Columbia Basin. The Idaho Power Co., on the other hand, is proposing to build three smaller dams on the river, producing fewer kilowatts, as a strictly private operation. One thing is certain: One side or the other will have to give, because the high Federal dam and the three small private dams are incompatible.

It seems to us that the Federal proposal for a high dam at Hells Canyon would provide for realization of the full potentialities of this enormously valuable water resource, while the company's proposal for a series of low dams—only one of which would be authorized at the present time—would lead to a piecemeal development of the river and probably prevent its full utilization.

This is a natural resource that belongs to all the people. It seems clear that the maximum benefit from the resource in this case, in respect to power, irrigation, navigation, and other facets of an integrated river program, can only be obtained by large-scale Federal investment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad that my colleague has called attention to the editorial published in today's New York Times. I am glad that great newspaper has joined with us after a study of the Hells Canyon issue. It satisfies me that the argument of a great many persons in opposition to the Hells Canyon Dam that eastern interests will not support Hells Canyon Dam simply indicates that they know not whereof they speak. When the great eastern interests come to see the importance of this dam to the Nation, we will gain the kind of support which we have received from the New York Times this morning.

In fact, I am glad to call attention to the fact that we may gain the support of some who do not fully recognize the fact that Hells Canyon Dam is not located in Idaho alone; that it will be built on the boundary between Idaho and Oregon; that one abutment of the dam will be in Oregon and the other abutment of the dam will be in Idaho; and that this arch across the common boundary of the Snake will provide storage of water for the power which would be generated as a result of that storage.

I wish to say to my colleagues in the Senate that the support we have received today from the New York Times is exceedingly significant, because this great newspaper, for a long time past, has been studying very carefully the facts and data concerning the project, and has come to the conclusion, which I am satisfied will be the overwhelming conclusion of people who study the matter, that the national interest will be served by the building of a high dam at Hells Canyon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am glad my colleague has pointed out the universality of the bill of which he is the principal sponsor. It is endorsed by newspapers as widely separated geographically as the New York Times, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and the Sacramento Bee.

Also, Mr. President, the charge has been made that so-called interests and legislators will not support the bill of which the senior Senator from Oregon is the principal sponsor. Yet his bill is co-sponsored by Senators from such widely separated States as New York, Michigan, Illinois, North Carolina, Alabama, and others of the great States of the Union which are 2,000 or 3,000 miles away from the State of Oregon.

As the senior Senator from Oregon has many times pointed out, if only the national administration would abandon its unyielding opposition to the construction of this greatest of all future river projects in our country, the dam would soon be built to the benefit of the people of the Northwest and of the entire Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that one of the most fallacious arguments ever advanced concerning this issue is that even though multipurpose development at Hells Canyon is obviously a national concern and involves the national interest, because a couple of Idaho Senators are opposed to it, therefore the dam must not be built, thus putting the whole Congress at the mercy of two Senators who may be opposed to the dam for their own reasons, but who are blocking the national interest involved in the project?

Does the Senator agree with me that that is about the height of fallacy, so far as an argument is concerned?

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is such a height of fallacy that it equals the height of Mount Everest or Kanchenjunga, K2, and other high pinnacles, because, if we followed their example, we would give to two Senators, any time any regional issue is on the floor of the Senate, veto power over the entire matter.

I am very glad the senior Senator from Oregon has emphasized the fact that the Snake River, which has trenched Hells Canyon through the ages, is located on the boundary of Oregon and Idaho, and is not in Idaho alone.

Some Senators have written letters indicating that Hells Canyon is only in Idaho. Inasmuch as Hells Canyon is many miles long and a mile deep, moving it away from the State of Oregon would be one of the greatest moving feats in the entire history of the world. I wonder if it would be done by Beacon Van and Storage.

FEDERAL COOPERATION IN NON-FEDERAL PROJECTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2442) to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first committee amendment was on page 4, line 15, after the word "that", to insert "(except in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects.)"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was on page 5, line 2, after the word "and", to strike out the comma and "in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects, any existing."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was in line 4, after the word "organization", to strike out "may" and insert "shall."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I have a group of amendments which I have worked out with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. I wish to express to them my deep appreciation for their cooperation in the matter, because I always believe in trying to work out differences over a bill with the sponsors of a bill. The Senators have made suggestions and I have made suggestions.

Some of the amendments, I may say to the Presiding Officer, properly should be called Douglas amendments. But while the Senator from Illinois has been in the chair, with the help of his legislative assistant, we have worked out what I consider to be a very satisfactory solution of our original differences with the sponsors.

I merely wish to make certain, as a matter of parliamentary procedure, that the consideration of the amendments will not be out of order once the committee amendments have been accepted, because the amendments I propose to offer refer to some of the sections covered by the committee amendments.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments may be agreed to en bloc, reserving to any Senator the right to offer amendments to the committee amendments, as though the bill were a clean bill.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the junior Senator from Louisiana that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The remaining amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 5, line 4, after the word "any", to strike out "contributions so required" and insert "security for repayment"; on page 13, line 7, after the word "that", to insert "(except in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects)"; in line 19, after the word "and", to strike out the comma and "in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects, any existing"; in line 20, after the word "irrigation", to insert "or other"; in line 21, after the word "organization", to insert a comma and "as well as other assets or income of the applicant organization,"; at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "contribution so required" and insert "security for repayment"; and on page 14, line 10, after the word "Congress", to strike out the comma and "except as hereinbefore provided for rehabilitation and betterment of any existing project."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer a group of amendments, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the senior Senator from Oregon.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 11, before the word "by", insert "on the effective date of this title."

On page 8, line 12, after the word "acres", insert "on existing projects."

On page 9, after line 9, insert the following new subsections:

(f) Provisions conforming to the excess land requirements set forth in the third sentence of section 46 of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 649), if the new project or unit of a new project furnishes irrigation service.

(g) Provisions conforming to the preference requirements contained in the proviso to section 9 (c) of the act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1193), if the project produces electric power for sale.

On page 17, line 7, strike out the period and insert "; and."

On page 17, between lines 7 and 8, insert a new subsection as follows:

(f) Provisions conforming to the preference requirements contained in the proviso to section 9 (c) of the act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1193), if the project produces electric power for sale.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before the discussion begins on the amendments offered by the senior Senator from Oregon, I think there should be a quorum call. I ask unanimous consent that, without losing his right to the floor, the senior Senator from Oregon may yield for the purpose of a quorum call.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will yield, with that understanding. First, however, I desire to have the attention of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], because the amendments, I may say, have been worked out in a very satisfactory manner in accordance with a conversation between the junior Senator from Louisiana and me earlier this afternoon, and comply with suggestions which the Senator from Louisiana made.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from California withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to withhold it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the senior Senator from Oregon is adjudged to have the right to the floor following the quorum call.

Mr. LONG. If I understand correctly, the amendments offered by the senior Senator from Oregon do not relate to title II of the bill, with the exception that one of them provides that any power generated from such facility would be subject to the preference clause.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. So far as title II is concerned, they do not relate to the 160-acre limitation, about which the Senator from Louisiana spoke, because those are not reclamation projects of the traditional in that section of the country covered by title II; they really are projects in which once every 2, 3, or 4 years there may be a scarcity of water, and water from other kinds of projects would be provided by the projects called for in the bill.

Mr. LONG. Sometimes the projects are drainage projects rather than reclamation projects.

Mr. MORSE. That is my understanding.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The bill represents a great deal of work on the part of three Senators who are now on the floor. I would not feel right if I did not comment

on that fact and say that we owe much, in the working out of the bill, to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

As a matter of fact, there was substantial opposition to the bill, because it excluded many of the farming areas of the country where drainage is a great necessity.

The junior Senator from Louisiana submitted a complete title II; therefore, so far as title II is concerned, there ought to be public acknowledgement of the fact that that part of the bill was worked out by the able junior Senator from Louisiana in conjunction with other Members from southern States. The Senators from Alabama became interested, and we received comments from a number of other Senators, including those in the farm belt.

Subsequently, when we began to work out title I, we took the bill which had originally been presented by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], in behalf of himself and several other Senators, and tried to patch the two bills together.

I commend the senior Senator from Nevada for helping us to get that work under way. He and I were extremely busy with many other obligations, so we asked the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] if he would contact the Members of the Senate and attempt to work out an acceptance bill for the subcommittee.

I want the RECORD to show that the junior Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Nevada, [Mr. MALONE], and the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] are entitled to the thanks of Congress for spending an endless amount of time in trying to harmonize all the different positions.

I should like to add to what I have said a statement which has been prepared, and which I believe is worth including in the RECORD. It relates to some additional comments, which are not now quite in order, because we have decided that perhaps we will lose some of the things which have been proposed; but I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the statement may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the portion of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2442 is known as the small projects bill and was introduced in the Senate on July 11 as a substitute for S. 164 and S. 405.

The principal features of these two bills are incorporated as title I of S. 2442, which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate loans for irrigation, conservancy or other public agencies in the 17 Western States for the construction or rehabilitation and betterment of authorized reclamation or other projects to cost not in excess of \$5 million. Where the cost of a project is more than \$500,000 specific authorization by act of Congress is required.

The Secretary of the Interior must approve the plans for the work, which in the main is in line with similar construction on reclamation projects. Adequate protection for the Federal investment is required and the Secretary is required to report the receipt of all applications to Congress and no con-

tract can be executed until funds are appropriated.

Title I had its inception in the desire to aid struggling irrigation districts in the West which had been constructed by local initiative and financing, as well as to permit Federal Reclamation projects to be financed by loans.

Title II extends the provisions of title I, so far as found practicable by the Secretary of Agriculture, to the 31 States (outside of the 17 Western reclamation States) and the territories of Hawaii and Alaska. This title defines a "project" as any complete reclamation, drainage, water storage, saline water intrusion control, or irrigation undertaking, or a complete self-contained and distinct enterprise. The limitation of \$5 million on the cost of any one project is carried in title II, as is also the provision that in the case of any project costing in excess of \$500,000 no contract shall be executed until same has been approved by act of Congress.

Appropriations of \$100 million are authorized under each title. As is the case of title I, the Secretary of Agriculture is required to advise Congress promptly on the receipt of a proposal or an application for a loan.

Under title III (General Provisions), the coordinating Act of August 14, 1946, with respect to fish and wildlife, recreation, etc. are applied, except in cases of projects solely for rehabilitation and betterment. The standard separability clause is included in the bill. This clause provides that in case any provision of the act shall be held invalid, the remainder shall not be affected thereby.

On July 11, the acting chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs inserted the full text of S. 2442 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with a statement on the objectives sought by the first two titles of the bill. At that time, notice was given to all persons, organizations or agencies concerned with the provisions of the bill that the committee intended to give prompt consideration to S. 2442 and report it out of committee as early as practicable. Consideration was given to the bill by the subcommittee and by the full committee, which ordered it reported favorably to the Senate on July 19.

The report, No. 1073, has been printed and contains explanations of the measure, together with comments of the various Executive agencies.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] should know that when the Senator from New Mexico, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and I had our conversation this afternoon, we mentioned the fact that the senior Senator from Nevada had great interest in the matter, too. He was engaged in other official business of the Senate at the time and was not available for the informal conversation which took place on the floor of the Senate when the other Senators I have named and I had a discussion and agreed upon a modification of certain amendments which had been previously discussed.

I wanted the senior Senator from Nevada to know that we did not proceed without taking into account our recognition of his great interest in the bill and our satisfaction that he would agree to the amendments we have decided to offer.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I appreciate the comments made by the junior Senator from New Mexico and the senior Senator from Oregon. As I understand, the modification to title I does not apply to already existing projects, but only to the new projects.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. I think it has been agreed that that is satisfactory.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe that is satisfactory to all concerned. However, I believe the Senator from California is right in suggesting that there should be a quorum call before the Senate proceeds with the consideration of the amendments which have been offered.

Mr. MORSE. I want to be certain that the senior Senator from Nevada understood that in regard to existing projects loans on individual holdings in excess of 160 acres will require interest payment upon the amount over and above 160 acres. I wanted that to be definitely understood. There is no free interest for the amount over and above 160 acres; but there is free interest up to 160 acres in accordance with the provision of the bill as reported.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	George	Millikin
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Barkley	Gore	Morse
Beall	Green	Mundt
Bender	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Scott
Chavez	Kerr	Smathers
Clements	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Daniel	Langer	Stennis
Dirksen	Lehman	Symington
Douglas	Long	Thurmond
Duff	Malone	Thye
Dworshak	Mansfield	Watkins
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Ervin	McCarthy	Williams
Flanders	McClellan	Young

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have nothing further to say with respect to my amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have his amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. MORSE. That is what I was about to request. I have nothing further to say, except to ask to have the amendments considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make clear to the Senate the circumstances under which the amendments are offered. I have discussed them with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. As the Presiding Officer [Mr. DOUGLAS] knows, some of them were his suggestions in the first instance.

They provide for the usual preference clause. They provide for interest over and above the 160 acres in any present project. The traditional 160-acre limitation of the reclamation law would apply to any new project in the future.

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], Senators from the South and from non-reclamation States are interested in title II.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Why should the Senator's amendment apply to irrigation features in other States?

Mr. MORSE. Because, as the Senator from Alabama has pointed out to us, those are not reclamation projects.

Mr. WATKINS. They provide for irrigation. It is possible to have irrigation outside the 17 Western States.

Mr. MORSE. It is standby irrigation, and not irrigation as it is known in the reclamation States.

Mr. WATKINS. We have some supplemental irrigation in the Western States. It is not 100 percent irrigation, because we do have some rainfall.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In my own State there are highly developed areas. The only trouble is that the water level has gone down 10 or 12 inches. The situation is beginning to reach the point where farmers need some assistance. With the kind of limitation proposed, they could receive no benefit at all.

Mr. WATKINS. In many Western States reclamation projects apply to developed areas where supplemental water is needed, just as the Senator from Arkansas has indicated it may be needed in his State. Yet there is an insistence in this body, and among those who are working on reclamation, that we must still retain the 160-acre limitation. If it is good for the West, it ought to be good for the entire Nation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. We recognized the situation which existed in the case of the San Luis Valley in Colorado, the State so ably presented, in part, by the

Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. We waived the 160-acre limitation. We do it right along.

Mr. WATKINS. That was by special legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but in this particular instance, in the case of ordinary farmland, the waiver of the 160-acre limitation is based upon the fact that in a great many instances more than 160 acres are required to make a family-sized farm, whereas, under irrigation, 160 acres are sufficient, and sometimes a far less number. It strikes me that it would be extremely unwise to apply a 160-acre limitation to ordinary farmland.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not have the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As the able Senator knows, the situation is that in California—and the same situation may apply in other States—a good many of the reclamation projects involve supplemental water. I do not refer to the opening of new public lands to development for the first time. I refer to a supplemental supply of water. Many of the farms and ranches consisting of 300 acres, 500 acres, or 1,000 acres, have been developed over a period of several generations. What is involved is purely a supplemental supply of water.

It seems to me that if the rule is good for the South it ought to be good for the West, under a similar situation. I have always favored the 160-acre limitation where new public lands are being brought into development for the first time, to prevent land speculation, and so forth. I think the 160-acre limitation in such cases is an excellent public policy.

The only reason I asked for the live quorum was that I think it is important that this question receive some discussion. So far as I know, there was no opposition on this side of the aisle to the bill as it was reported from the committee. There is still no opposition to the bill as it was reported. However, when we began to rewrite the bill on the floor with certain amendments which may be technical but may at the same time be far-reaching, and in the closing days of the session, I think we are entitled to a full discussion of the subject.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I could not agree more fully with the able minority leader. We are entitled to full discussion. However, many times when we have been discussing the question of supplemental water in irrigation projects, I, for one, and many others, have tried to point out that a man could go into the Yuma area, for example, and, if he could raise the right kind of vegetables, he could make a very good living on 4 or 5 acres. Near Salinas, Calif., he could make a living on less than that.

But when we get to the ordinary farmlands of the West, where farmers must depend upon rice, wheat, and other crops, they cannot make a living on a limited acreage. Therefore I have many times resisted the 160-acre limitation under those circumstances, and would do so again.

It seems to me there is no sensible reason for applying the 160-acre limitation under title II, and thereby disturbing the pattern of agriculture which already exists in those areas. I am not sure that I am completely satisfied with the 160-acre limitation where it now exists.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there has been some discussion to the effect that the western reclamation laws, so-called, should be extended to the 48 States. Perhaps, as a matter of public policy, Congress will determine to do so.

If that were done, would the Senator feel that there should be one rule for the existing reclamation States and another rule for the States which were added as reclamation States, so as to have two classes of States?

Mr. ANDERSON. In that connection I must say that I believe there is a difference in areas, and I must say also to the minority leader that in a project in the northern part of Wyoming I have said the 160-acre limitation should apply, because it was solely grass land. I believe when we enacted the Grand Coulee Dam legislation there were areas in that project to which the 160-acre limitation should not apply. Congress passed a bill for the Riverton project in Wyoming with a 160-acre limitation in it. From that day on we have tried to correct the situation, by moving veterans to other areas. No great service was done by putting that limitation in the law.

I say that one of the most difficult problems which will be lying ahead is the applicability of the 160-acre limitation, if reclamation moves to other States. Senators from the Mississippi Delta area know that people in those States are beginning to use irrigation. It is a very natural development. I believe it would be an extremely difficult problem to apply a 160-acre limitation to such areas. It is a matter which will require a great deal of study by the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I recall, so far as my State is concerned, that about 5 years ago the Senate passed a bill which undertook to extend the reclamation law to Arkansas. The bill went to the House, but it was never acted on by that body. The principal opponent of it was a Representative in the House whose section of the country I thought would benefit directly from such a bill. He said to me, "I cannot take that kind of bill, for the reason that we are dealing here with an area that is already developed. It is highly productive. We either have to have the assistance without that provision, or not at all."

I am quite certain that the limitation cannot be applied in the delta section or in the rice section, either. No public lands are being brought in from virgin desert land, as is the case in Utah, for example.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to make a brief reply. The fact is that now in the West practically all new land or public land that could be brought under cultivation has already been brought under cultivation. I would say roughly that probably 70 percent or 80 percent of the projects now are furnishing water as a

supplemental supply for areas which are of the kind the Senator from Arkansas has described in Arkansas or in the Mississippi delta. That is also true of the whole Central Valley in California. It is true in my State. It is true in Arizona where new lands are being brought in. It is true of practically every 1 of the 17 Western States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true, however, that the lands to which the Senator is referring were originally brought in under the 160-acre limitation?

Mr. WATKINS. Most of them are lands which were put under irrigation long before the original reclamation law was passed. Eighty-five percent of the irrigated land in the West was not developed under the reclamation law, but under the individual enterprise system. Reclamation was an entirely new program. The people could not handle the matter themselves, and they did not know how to finance it. The Federal Government wanted the resource put to use. The water was there. Therefore, the Federal Government inaugurated this program, and it put a 160-acre limitation on it. The principle is completely outdated in our areas. We have the same problem the Senator has mentioned. The minute we try to have the limitation lifted, we meet with opposition. I would be perfectly willing to have the bill apply to the whole country, just as Senators want to have it apply to the Western States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true that in the Senator's State, as well as in the other Western States, there is a limited amount of water, which gives concern to those States so far as the equitable distribution of it is concerned? In my State there is no question of a limited supply of water. One of our problems is that we have too much water. We are seeking a means by which we can make the water available. We are not faced with the problem of a limited amount of water. I assume that in the West there is the element of a limited supply of water for which equitable distribution is being sought. That is not our problem.

Mr. WATKINS. It is true that we have a limited amount of water, but irrigation is needed to meet the problems the Senator has mentioned, and that is provided in the bill for the other States outside the reclamation States. We do need extra water, because nature does not provide it at the time it is needed the most.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Our problem is that we have the big rivers in which the water flows past us in periods of drought, but we cannot get the water up on the land. It is all going out to sea.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what we have in the upper Colorado area. A great deal of the water is flowing down into the sea. However we still have the 160-acre limitation; although in my State much more water would be put on older areas, which do not have enough water and need supplemental water, than would be put on new land. I believe the figures show that there are 32,000 acres of new

land and more than 100,000 acres of old land.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield if the Senator from Utah has concluded his statement.

Mr. WATKINS. The suggested provision seems to me to be, inequitable because under it one-half the country would have one kind of law applied to it, and the 17 Western States would have an entirely different law applied to them, even though the conditions are similar.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I may point out to the Senator from Utah, and to the Senator from Oregon, as well, that, coming from a nonreclamation State, I would be willing to vote for whatever arrangement the Senators from the 17 reclamation States wish. If they would like to have the 160-acre limitation applied, that would be all right with me. If they do not want the 160-acre limitation applied, and would like to have no limitation whatever applied, that would be all right with me, too.

However, speaking in behalf of a State which is not a reclamation State, I should like to say that we have had no experience whatever with a 160-acre limitation. We do not do business that way. If a farmer has a 160-acre farm, that is probably due to an accident, because there is no law in our State which has any relationship to a farm of 160 acres. There is no new land to be distributed. All the land is under private ownership. Whenever any of our people want more water, they simply get together and assess themselves. They float a bond issue and they assess themselves, and everyone pays his fair share of the taxes to pay off the bonds.

To try to apply a 160-acre limitation to Louisiana, because such a limitation has some rhyme or reason in a Western State, would not make any sense to us. Nor do we think it would make any sense in any of the other 31 nonreclamation States.

We believe that there is one item connected with this subject which is of considerable interest to us. When we borrow money, we must pay 2 percent or 3 percent or 3½ percent interest. On the other hand, when people of the Western States borrow money for a similar purpose, they can borrow the money interest free. If it is our money which is being loaned, we would like to have a chance to borrow some of it, too, because we contribute our share of the taxes. That is why we would suggest that some of the money be made available for loans for irrigation, drainage, and also for the control of salt-water intrusion. In the lower alluvial areas it is possible to obtain unlimited quantities of fresh water, except that in the dry season the salt water works its way upstream and contaminates the fresh water. Because of that, the fresh water is no longer usable.

Low-water dams would make the rivers usable for much longer periods of time,

and larger supplies of fresh water would therefore be available.

However, in no case would a 160-acre limitation be helpful in financing or making a project feasible in areas such as Louisiana, and I assume the situation is the same in Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, and perhaps in many of the Northern and Western States. The people of the 17 reclamation States have had experience with such a limitation; and if that is what they want, those of us in the Southern and Eastern States should have no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not have any objection. I have no objection at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has the floor.

THE MAJOR QUESTION OF INCLUDING REMAINDER OF STATES NOT AN ISSUE HERE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, apparently this has become a general discussion. I do not believe it was the intention of anyone to open up general debate on the question of whether the Eastern States should be included under the reclamation law at this time.

I remember that the distinguished Senators from Arkansas tried to include their State in the reclamation States area a few years ago, and it was decided not to include it at that time.

I have been in the engineering business 30 years, and I have always said that sometime there will be a realization in the Corn Belt and in the Eastern and Southern States that the 10 to 30 days of dry weather during a period in the growing season could be alleviated by irrigation.

They are beginning to realize it now, but adding States to the reclamation area, that would be a separate question to be debated on its merits.

Senator Newlands, of Nevada, in 1902, proposed the original law which has now developed into the Bureau of Reclamation. It was for the benefit of the public lands mostly in the 11 Western States, to increase their taxable value. West of the meridian about midway in Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Nebraska, and the two Dakotas, the territory was considered semiarid. Those six States were included in the reclamation program because of their semiarid condition. The reclamation fund is augmented through the sale of public lands and through oil and gas development, since 52½ percent of the income from those lands went into the reclamation fund to be expended in those States.

No such revenue accrues to the reclamation fund for the State of Illinois.

If we did include all the States of the Union in the reclamation area they would benefit from the fund which is contributed to by the public-land States alone.

We made an early mistake by agreeing to pay the money back without interest, because we furnish flood control when storing irrigation water.

PROBLEM REVERSED

In the West, where we store water for use in irrigation, we furnish flood con-

trol automatically. If we had called it flood control instead of irrigation we would not have had to repay the principal. In the humid areas the problem is to get water off the land and into the stream—in the arid areas the problem is to get it out of the stream and on to the land.

Much of the land, possibly 80 or 90 percent, was irrigated by simply diverting the natural flow of the streams and rivers. But in many areas it was found that the low streamflow in the middle of the summer made it impossible to complete the crop. Therefore, in order to supplement the supply for land already under irrigation, projects were undertaken to store the early runoff to supply late irrigation needs.

I think the distinguished Senator from Illinois is behind the times, possibly he has not quite kept pace with the situation. There are no new projects at this time bringing in public lands alone. They need a supplemental supply just as in the case of Arkansas when they need a supplemental supply in dry weather. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas is well aware of this situation.

I did not object when the distinguished Senator from Illinois said that if there are new lands brought in they could be subject to the 160-acre limitation, because it is already in the law, and if we undertook to iron it out here there would be a major discussion. Sometime we should take up that question on its merits. We can live with the amendment, so we did not object to it.

If we abide by the bill as it came out of committee, I think it will prove to be a very good bill. So far as I am concerned, we can live with these amendments if they do not apply to projects already constructed or authorized.

So far as the power preference is concerned, it is already included in the existing law.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Does this amendment—I have not had a chance to read it or study it—provide that new lands will have applied to them the 160-acre provision?

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. As to the lands which are involved in this bill, the 160-acre requirement does not apply. As to new projects, it would apply.

Mr. WATKINS. What about projects where land is brought in which has not been previously under cultivation?

Mr. MORSE. This is a small-project bill. Only the lands needed for the projects are under the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. There may be some areas where there will be some public lands. Part of an owner's land is under cultivation and part of it is not.

Mr. MORSE. But there is a ceiling on the amount of money involved. So long as they come under the ceiling, the point of the Senator from Nevada would apply. But the statement which I wanted to make to the Senator from Utah is that we should do it in general legislation. This is special legislation;

it is not general legislation. This applies to the so-called small projects.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not general legislation so far as it goes?

Mr. MORSE. As to this type of projects.

Mr. WATKINS. I am not speaking of the general Reclamation Act. It still has that limitation of 160 acres, whether it is supplemental water, or water for new land. Every time we have brought in any proposal to amend the act or to change it slightly, we have met opposition which largely comes not from the reclamation States, but outside the reclamation States. We face exactly the same situation described by the Senator from Arkansas as to lands which are already under cultivation.

Mr. MORSE. As to my own State, I would have to say, making an interpretation of public opinion in my own State, that there would be a considerable amount of opposition to general legislation which would lift the 160-acre limitation.

Mr. WATKINS. I think probably Oregon and Washington have the few projects left where there are public lands.

Mr. MORSE. We have some in Oregon.

Mr. WATKINS. In the Grand Coulee no doubt there is acreage which is new land, land which the Federal Government is putting to use for the first time, which is not a supplemental water right for the first time.

Mr. MORSE. My feeling is—

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I feel that we are in this legislative situation. There is, or there was, a considerable amount of disagreement about this proposal. I endeavored to see if we could reconcile the disagreements and reach a common denominator of agreement, so that the bill could be passed. That is why I took up the matter with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. We communicated with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] subsequently, because we could not reach him at the time of our discussion. He was engaged in other business of the Senate. But the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] made very clear to me the interest of the senior Senator from Nevada and his participation in the work on the bill.

We left our conference in full agreement on the amendments, because we thought they met the situation.

In the future we can take up the general problem which the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] has raised with respect to the 160-acre limitation on reclamation generally throughout the country. But I do not believe that question should be raised in connection with this bill. I think the bill is in an acceptable form with the proposed amendments, and it ought to be passed in this form. That is why we offered the amendments.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from North Dakota will withhold his request for the regular order, I will yield the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. I would rather discuss the matter with the Senator while he has the floor and get his reaction to my views.

I support the bill as it was reported. I had some misgivings about the reclamation program in States which never had any irrigation, and did not have anything but riparian water rights. But since they were willing to take a chance, I supported them.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, since the Senator from Oregon has yielded the floor, I should like to make a statement in connection with the drainage areas in the East. I make no objection to the lack of a 160-acre limitation, because I do not think that limitation ought now to apply to any of the lands either in the West or the East.

But I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that if, with public money, there is drained an area which never before has been drained, it is being made useful for the first time, exactly as if water were being put on the land for the first time. There is no difference except in the procedure. One is trying to get water off the land; the other is trying to get it on the land. The difference is that the precedent has been set, since 1902, of the reclamation States repaying the original cost with no interest; whereas in the case of flood control, which is an attempt to drain water off the land, the precedent has been set for 75 years at least of never paying any of the money back at all, either interest or principal.

I have never objected to that procedure, because it is public policy, congressional policy, established for at least 75 years.

But I merely call attention again to the fact that whether the public lands are reclaimed by drainage or by irrigation, the same job is being done. If crops are saved by irrigation for 30 days or 2 weeks, they can be saved from the hot winds or the hot weather in Arkansas, as is done in other areas. The procedure is the same.

The reason I did not offer any objection to the lack of a 160-acre limitation was that I think the limitation should be removed from all such lands.

I understand the reason why the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] takes the position he does. He is a stickler for precedent. I am certain he does not understand the situation in the West. I hope that some day he will take a little trip there. We will show him some of the areas on which the farmers have worked hard all their lives—in some instances for 2 or 3 generations—to bring about the irrigation which has been discussed in the Senate since 1902.

I believe that the 160-acre limitation, in the first place, was reasonable if someone could control 3 or 4 sections of land, where there was no irrigation, and get

Government money to develop it. Then he would be profiting by it. Perhaps it could not be done, but even in that case there is a question, because the land is being placed on the tax rolls, and is being made valuable, taxable property, which it was not before.

So I think there are many technicalities which have developed over the years. I have listened to discussions of this subject for 9 years, and I am glad we have had a chance to air it today.

This particular bill has been well thought out in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, first by a subcommittee and then by the entire committee. Then anyone who had objections was allowed to state them.

Simply because we think we can live with the bill, not because we like it, I should like to see the bill passed without any changes at all, except the amendments which have been accepted. I think we can live with the bill, and I am willing to vote for it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, on behalf of the committee, I am willing to accept the amendments, but I know they must be put to a vote.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I did not intend to discuss the matter tonight, because the committee was unanimously in favor of the bill. I did not object to the program, although I felt the States which have not had any experience with water rights, and where the problem is to get the water off the land and into the rivers, would have much difficulty.

Where there are riparian rights, there will be difficulty, because someone down below may object to the water being taken out, thus impairing his right to have the water flow over his land at the low-water season. That is one of the headaches which will have to be taken care of as we go along. I understand that.

The Senator from Louisiana also said something about getting interest from the money. Additional matters are being brought in which are not in the ordinary reclamation act. I do not know of anything in the act, unless it is especially written into it, which makes provision to do something to keep salt water from running into fresh-water streams. Perhaps by putting fresh water on the land, filling up the ground water, and backing it up to keep the salt water, the water under the lands might be kept off the land, and could be pumped and used as an irrigation supply.

There has been no program worked out in those States. They have not got themselves into a position such as we are in the West. They have exhausted all their own resources, and cannot accomplish this purpose themselves; therefore they must call upon the Government.

I merely point this out. I am not opposing the bill for that reason. I simply state what was the basic philosophy back of the Reclamation Act.

The people of the Western States, the arid States, had gone as far as they could go under their own steam. They did not have the resources to go any further. The United States owned the public land. Water was needed. It was impossible, if people wanted to locate their homes there, to get the water on the

land. So the water was put there for their use. It was the universal policy of the Government to do that only when the people could not do it themselves. That was when the Government entered into the picture.

Eighty-five percent of the irrigation in the West has been developed by the people with their own resources. The people went as far as they could. The only projects which remained were those that required help from the Government under a program such as we have before us.

We have no policy, for that matter, of interest-free money, as it is called, on that kind of development program, because the United States wanted those resources developed, and was willing to develop them if the people would do the job.

Flood control, as has been pointed out many times, is a program which benefits individuals by the millions who live all along the streams. Our good friend, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], has seen the justice of that situation and has gone at least part way to remedy the condition. He introduced a bill a number of years ago under which the people who received flood control benefits, but were not paying anything, would pay at least 50 percent of the cost of the benefits. Some day we will get him to go the whole distance. If he wants to join in the clamor that we must pay interest, then he will have to go further and take an interest in these programs.

I assume his conscience would feel better if he made the proposal retroactive and made the people pay for all the benefits they received in the past, not at a rate of 12 percent but at 2 percent, as was being done on the upper Colorado project, because there would not be enough money in the United States to pay it. It has been going on all these years.

We want to be fair about this matter. Even though the Eastern States—States which are outside the reclamation area—have not shown yet that they have exhausted their resources and have gotten into the position we were in before they got a project, I am willing to let them come in under this arrangement. Sometimes I wonder if they are not a little unwise. Maybe their consciences are hurting them. It has been suggested that perhaps they are wrong; that if they come under the program, they will have to pay the interest back.

I do not want to oppose the amendments of the Senator from Oregon. I think possibly it will be satisfactory to take them to conference. My own judgment is—I will not say they are unworkable, because I intend to vote for them—that they will cause a lot of trouble. A new department, the Department of Agriculture, is brought in. Its engineers will have to work on the problem. The Department of the Interior, which has had 50 years' experience, is eliminated.

I hope those involved will get some experience. I hope it will all be profitable. But, as one who has had experience in the irrigation field and with the organizations and setups involved, and

knows of the necessity of giving mortgages on water rights, as well as on land, in order to guarantee repayment to the United States, I wish to say that those who will come under the program are in for very interesting times.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that I appreciate the statement he has just made—that he is willing to let the amendments go to conference and that he hopes they will work out. No one has a higher regard for the Senator from Utah than I have, and no one could evaluate the suggestions he has made to the committee more than I could.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I wish to say the Senator from New Mexico is a dirt farmer. He gets on the farm and irrigates. He is one of the biggest irrigation farmers in New Mexico. So he is speaking from experience.

I think the whole program is going to be difficult to get by a veto. I hope there will not be a veto, but there may be. We will have to take a chance on there being a veto. My personal opinion is that the bill is good, in spite of its general weakness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 5881, and that the House bill be considered and amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the text of the Senate bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from further consideration of H. R. 5881.

The Chair lays before the Senate H. R. 5881, which will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and to insert in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 2442, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5881) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill, S. 2442, is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. LONG, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. WATKINS conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think the Senate has just passed a very constructive piece of legislation. The Senator from Illinois very carefully kept out of the discussion during the delicate negotiations connected with the Morse amendment, because he was afraid that if he expressed his opinion on these matters he might disturb the concord which was apparently developing. He wishes also to thank the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] for their constructive work. However, in view of the comments of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] on general reclamation policies and their personal references to me, I do not wish to have this occasion pass without making a few remarks about the general 160-acre limitation on irrigated lands and the policy of the United States both toward public lands and toward irrigation projects in general.

In developing the public-lands policy, as far back as the Civil War, the principle was adopted that the public lands should be used not to build up large estates with a few owners and many wage-earners and tenants, but to build up family-size farms, which were then approximately 160 acres. It was on that basis that the Homestead Act was passed during the Civil War. This was very constructive legislation. The Middle West was settled on the basis of the 160-acre farm. And it was because of this that we became the valley of democracy. As settlement moved into the Southwest area and into the Far West, there were found old Spanish land grants under which enormous amounts of land have been granted to individual holders. Estates ran into the tens of thousands of acres, and I believe in some cases into the hundreds of thousands of acres. Those concentrated Spanish land grants carried over as this country took over the territory from Mexico. That was particularly true in California, but it was also true in other territories. It resulted in a concentration of land ownership which was contrary to the American system of diffused ownership.

Then a great man from the State of Nevada, Francis G. Newlands, with Theo-

dore Roosevelt, worked out the reclamation law of 1903. Under that law, the Nation as a whole loaned money for irrigation projects and made a contribution of interest to those projects. The loans were interest free—

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator recall that somewhere along the line, if it was not in the original bill, royalties and income from public-land development in the West were to go into a special fund, to be known as the reclamation fund, a revolving fund, for the purpose of developing those areas, and the fund to which the Senator is referring did not come from the whole Nation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is probably true, but certainly there have been large appropriations from the general Treasury for such purposes.

Mr. WATKINS. That started in the depression days, when there was an attempt made to have that type of project work.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to speak about the Newlands policy.

The idea was that these public moneys, contributed by the Nation as a whole, should be used, not to build up or to continue big estates, but, insofar as possible, to develop family-size farms; and for that purpose Senator Newlands took over the old homestead basis of 160 acres. Of course, in practice, that is not actually a 160-acre limitation; instead, it is a 320-acre limitation, because, as I understand it, both man and wife are entitled to 160 acres each—or a total of 320 acres, or half a square mile, or twice the size of the homestead farm on the basis of which the Midwest was built up.

The Newlands theory was that since the Nation as a whole contributed these moneys for irrigation, it should ask, in return, that the family-size farm be the basis for the development of the Southwest, in Rocky Mountain area and of the Far West, as had been the case in the Midwest. I think Senator Newlands was one of the great, constructive statesmen of the last 50 years.

That principle was intended, not only for public lands, as the Senator from Nevada has said, but also for the use of water on private lands. There was to be no limitation on the size of the private lands in the West; but if it was desired to have additional water, largely financed at public expense, then there was to be a limitation of the water to the use of farms not in excess of 160 acres each, or a total of 320 acres for a man and his wife.

Of course, this issue has been a very sharply contested one, particularly in the State of California. My good friend, the Senator from Nevada, extended to me an invitation to come West, and implied that I had not been in the West. I shall be very glad to go West with him, if he will make that an official invitation, because I can think of no one with whom I would rather travel and go hunting and fishing than with the Senator from Nevada.

However, I am not entirely ignorant on this subject. I have spent some days in the Central Valley of California, traveling through most of that valley, observing the villages, the irrigation projects, and the reservoirs.

I have spent some time in Arizona and have watched the early irrigation and reclamation projects there. I have seen other irrigation projects on the spot.

The big farmers, who in many cases still have farms comprising thousands of acres, wish to get this irrigation water at public expense, without having to conform to the principles that Senator Newlands and Theodore Roosevelt laid down in 1903. The basic issue is covered up in a maze of technicalities and point-scoring which obscures the fundamental facts. As a result of this battle, the principle has been eaten into from time to time, and, indeed, is under great jeopardy at this moment.

Let me say that—as anyone who is familiar with the fruit industry is aware—the 160-acre or, in total, 320-acre limitation for a fruit orchard allows for vastly more acreage than is needed in order to make a very rich and sumptuous living for a family. Certainly in the Central Valley of California one can make an extremely good living on an orchard of, I suppose, 40 acres; in fact, even less acreage might suffice. Yet public irrigation water will be furnished to a farm of up to 320 acres, provided the farmer has a wife. All that the basic reclamation law does is to place some check upon public water furnished to farms in excess of 320 acres.

We always hear that the 320-acre limitation is not adapted to certain high areas where hay or other forage crops are grown. That may well be true. It is interesting that the principle of flexibility is always called upon to expand the 160-acre or 320-acre limitation, but never is applied to restrict it for the orchard regions or for the commercial vegetable regions—those where asparagus, lettuce, and so forth, are grown in irrigation lowlands. So we are always being asked to make exceptions to expand the limits, but we are never permitted to apply flexibility to restrict these amounts.

Offhand, I would say that probably in a great many reclamation areas the point where further development is uneconomical has now been reached. When reclamation projects are developed at high altitudes, where the growing season is, of necessity, short, and where the winters are severe, and where the frosts stay late and come early, in such areas we find that the crops primarily raised are hay and other forage crops. Someone has asked, "Are not these worthy crops?" Of course, they are, Mr. President; but the point is that they are of very low value and it is virtually impossible to make the irrigation project pay out even for the principal.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Illinois to say that when he traveled in the West, he found that in some of the hill areas lettuce was not raised?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was saying that, of course, we find high-value commercial agriculture being conducted in low-lying lands in Arizona and California; and in those areas we find that lettuce, asparagus, and other crops are raised, side by side with the orchards.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the distinguished Senator from Illinois know that in North Dakota—where, of course, he has been—we raise just as much lettuce in high lands as we do in low lands?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly I do not wish to get into an argument with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota about the versatility of North Dakota land. I shall be very glad to come to North Dakota and share some of the North Dakota asparagus.

Mr. LANGER. I shall be delighted to have the Senator from Illinois come there. I wish to let him know that we raise asparagus, lettuce, and other truck-garden vegetables in some of the highest hills of our State. We have excellent soil there—whether in the low lands or in the high lands.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think the Morse amendment is a very constructive move. On existing irrigation projects, it waives the 160-acre limitation; but it imposes the 160-acre or 320-acre limitation on new lands; and, therefore, at least, it saves the general principle, which is highly important.

I wish to say that our good friends from the West should not regard this issue as one which concerns them alone. The funds for these projects are contributed by the Nation as a whole, and have been contributed by the Nation as a whole for the last 50 years. We are glad to have developed a great many of these lands in the West and to have paid for them; but, in return, we simply ask that this development and contribution not be used for the building up of a few big farms with a few big proprietors and with hundreds and thousands of hired agricultural laborers. A society on that basis is a very unsound one and is not the America which we love.

On one of the days I spent in the Central Valley of California, I came, at evening, when dusk was falling, to a small village. I entered the village. It had one store, where overalls and rough clothing were sold. There was one other place of business—a tavern. The population of the community consisted almost entirely of hired laborers. It was a sordid town built on big holdings and a large class of landless workers. That is not a very healthy situation, because in America we want instead a wide distribution of landed property.

The next day I was fortunate enough to come to another village in the same valley, where there were a number of stores, well-paved residential streets, good houses, and small orchards. The land was split up into small holdings cultivated by small proprietors.

The second village was an American village. So long as we have villages like that in the United States, the agricultural base of our economy will be strong, to the degree that they exist. But if we ever get into the condition in which the first type of village which I mentioned predominates; namely, a few big proprietors and large numbers of hired workers who do not own the soil on which they work, whose jobs are insecure, whose alternative employments are few, and whose standard of living is low, then we get into a condition almost of peonage, similar to that which I have seen in southern Italy. Which type of America do we want?

It is for that very reason that the Senator from Illinois, in times past, as well as today, has opposed the removal of the 160-acre limitation. I am perfectly willing to debate this issue in the country as a whole, with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] if they so desire. While I know that their motives are good and their hearts are pure, nevertheless, if we remove this limitation and furnish water at public expense to maintain and increase large holdings, we are striking a blow at the economic foundations of democracy in our farm centers of the West.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Would the Senator favor, for example, under a flood-control measure requiring private land owners to pay 50 percent, a provision that no one could receive any benefits under flood control except to the extent of 160 acres?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to point out that, in the first place, in the Midwest we were never cursed with the Spanish land grants. We were able to start with virgin soil, and establish the basis of the 160-acre farm. The 160-acre farm is being increased by economic forces. We are developing, in part, a group of farm laborers and tenants, though the problem of tenantry is not as severe as it was some years ago. But fortunately we have been able to get a much wider distribution of the land than is true in the Southwest, and in the Central and Imperial Valleys of California.

Mr. WATKINS. Mexico once had control in the Southwest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is what I am saying.

Mr. WATKINS. In many other States that situation did not exist at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was true in the North.

Mr. WATKINS. But there are many small farms in California, Arizona, and New Mexico.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the principle of the Newlands Act is absolutely sound, and we must bear it in mind. It is not something to be laughed off or sneered at. It is a principle to which we should hold. That is all the Senator from Illinois is trying to do. If Senators from the West were willing to make the 160-acre limitation more restrictive with respects to orchards and commercial vegetables, I would be will-

ing to make it less restrictive with respect to hay.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator realize that in the growing of fruit it is very difficult for the small farmer to exist and maintain his family in competition with the larger orchards? The spraying equipment, tractors, harvesting crews, washing machines, and all those things which are required are very expensive for the small farmer. But if a farmer has four or five hundred acres—I understand the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has some 4,600 acres—he can follow a good, workable program, with the finest of equipment. It is difficult for the small farmer to compete with the large orchards. I happen to be a fruit grower. I know whereof I speak. I have approximately 70 acres. Many small orchardists try to get by with 10 or 15 acres. They cannot do it.

I am having difficulty in making my orchards pay, fighting pests, drought, frost, and all that sort of thing, and keen competition with larger operators. I would recommend, from a business point of view, that the acreage of orchards be multiplied by 10, so as to result in orchards which can be economically operated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are two ways of looking at the farm. One way of looking at the farm is merely as a means of making money. The other way of looking at the farm is to regard it as a way of life. We have adopted the philosophy, particularly through the Homestead Act, that farming is a way of life, and that the small family farm has a place in America.

I think I am aware of some of the difficulties faced by small farmers. The Senator from Utah is also aware of some of the difficulties. I say that we should not increase those difficulties by governmental aid given primarily to the big farmers. We should not take governmental steps to make it still more difficult for the small farmer to get along.

In the second place, I suggest that a great many of the difficulties of the small farmer—at least with respect to orchards—could be met by cooperation, under a plan whereby the small farmers could pool their resources and buy some of the necessary equipment and use it cooperatively. I think the Senator from Utah is not unfriendly to cooperatives. He was a leader in the cooperative movement in his State. I congratulate him on that, and urge him on to greater efforts in that line, rather than merely trusting to the steam roller of the larger farmer to roll over the small farmer. Surely he does not believe that because the small farmers having difficulties, we should help to put them out of business.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator for what he said about my work with cooperatives. I have worked with them. Frankly, we have not yet succeeded, after some 50 years of trying, in persuading the farmers to join together in

cooperative use of machinery and equipment needed in orchards. They have different ways of doing things. They are highly individualistic, and the plan simply does not work. That is why they are having difficulty. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am always glad to yield.

Unless the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] wishes to enter the fray, I am willing to yield the floor.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to be recognized in my own right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PUBLIC LAND HELD IN TRUST FOR THE STATES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the senior Senator from Nevada was consulting engineer on the Central Valley project, which the Senator from Illinois visited for 1 day.

As a result, the senior Senator from Nevada understands the objectives of the people living under it.

As a matter of fact, he had a hand in organizing most of the irrigation and power districts in his home State of Nevada, either as State engineer or as a private engineer, and many of the projects in the 11 Western States. He grew up with the problem during the past 40-year period about which we have been talking.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the land in the Corn Belt area including Illinois, Iowa, and Indiana was obtained on a 160-acre homestead for a \$16 filing fee. The land was given to the farmers with the condition that they live on the land for a stated period and put a stated amount of such land under cultivation each year for 3 years. They would then receive a patent in fee without any further payment.

For 140 years, beginning with the 1840 Redemption Act, followed by the Homestead Act of 1863, the policy of the United States Congress was definitely established to hold all public lands in trust for the States until they could enact legislation under which such lands could be taken up in family-sized units.

When they reached western Kansas in the semiarid area 160 acres was not enough. So the Congress arranged for an individual to file an additional homestead of 160 acres.

Then when the mesa in eastern Colorado was reached 320 acres was just an aggravation. So they were allowed a stock raising homestead of 640 acres, making a total of 960 acres. When they reached the Great American Desert, including parts of Utah and Nevada, 960 acres were again just an aggravation where, according to surveys made by the United States Geological Survey, it required as much as 140 acres to support a cow unit, a cow and a calf.

Congress made no further effort to pass a land law under which land could be taken up to support 250 head of cattle or a band of sheep for a family unit.

We were then talking in terms of townships, not sections.

Then Senator Newlands, whose memory we respect in my State of Nevada, proposed an act, passed in 1902, to irrigate some of these lands carved out of the public land of the Western States.

We have never objected to the 160-acre unit where we could live with it. We have accepted it except where it was an impossible situation. However, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, if he will look at his own State—and he does not have to look very far—he will discover many landowners benefiting from public funds regardless of the size of the ranch or farms originally patented by the 160-acre unit through a payment of a \$16 filing fee—where millions of dollars have been appropriated for flood control with no repayment at all, either principal or interest. Of course where the land is no longer flooded its value is increased regardless of the size of the farm units. No one in Congress has seriously objected to it since it has long been an established policy of Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois has objected to it. I was the first to propose that a large portion of the cost should be paid by special assessments on the land that has been benefited.

Mr. MALONE. I will join the Senator from Illinois in introducing a bill that will provide for the repayment of the principle without interest on all flood control projects, just as we do in the reclamation States. We can prepare the bill and introduce it tomorrow.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the case of land adjoining rivers, there is another—

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator wish me to yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the case of land adjoining rivers, there is another ostensible purpose, although in many cases the real purpose is navigation, and the incidental byproduct is by narrowing the channel, by clearing out a large portion of swampland, more land is made arable.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I should like to ask for the regular order.

Mr. MALONE. This is the regular order. Do I have the floor, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Then I shall proceed. I served 6 years on the Public Works Committee. I am familiar with the testimony on flood-control projects located in the Senator's State.

Then I have reviewed projects in Kansas and Missouri with my friend, Senator HENNINGS, of that State, and in Kansas with my friend, Senator SCHOEPP, of Kansas, in connection with the great flood in the Kansas City area. I expected the cost to be covered by the Federal Government, not because Kansas City could not pay for it, but because it was a settled policy of the Congress.

Incidentally, when a dam was proposed in eastern Kansas for the purpose of controlling floods, the purpose is not

irrigation or navigation, but to prevent lands from being flooded.

Any time the distinguished Senator from Illinois wishes to introduce a bill which will require repayment of flood-control expenditures I will join him.

The congressional policy, which has been in existence for 75 years, that when the Army engineers report the benefits exceed the cost of any certain project, then Congress may consider through its regular committees the building of such a project at taxpayers' expense to control the floods, or for navigation or for improvement of harbors. However, when the distinguished Senator from Illinois tries to make it appear that the cost is all for navigation, he is mistaken.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Flood control and navigation are joint purposes, and one of the incidental byproducts is to make swampland adjoining the rivers arable.

Mr. MALONE. Flood control and navigation may be the joint purpose but often it is simply flood control, but the money is not repaid in any case. They have been benefiting for 75 years, when as a matter of fact, there is probably no valid reason why the beneficiaries should not pay for any improvement in navigation.

I say again to the distinguished Senator, any time he is ready to introduce a bill, under which those States would repay the money, exactly as we do in the reclamation States, I shall be happy to join him. The money expended for reclamation has been repaid with very few losses, over the past 53 years. Very little money has been lost to the taxpayers.

I have listened to the Senator from Illinois for the 7 years he has been in the Senate object to small appropriations on projects and then vote for the entire appropriation.

When I invited the Senator to come West with me, I did not mean to have him fly over the land or spend one day on a project. I intended him to come out and take a good look to see how the people farming the area live. They improve the land where they had no adequate water supply. Those are the kind of people we have been helping to improve the desert with interest-free money. Flood control reclaims flooded land just as irrigation reclaims desert land.

Under the bill we passed this afternoon all of the States, including Illinois, can drain the swampland which is now absolutely useless, by merely paying back the money without interest.

The Senator's State can take the water off the land and make it valuable, whereas we need to put it on the land to increase its productivity.

I shall be glad to answer any questions in regard to the procedure that the distinguished Senator from Illinois desires to ask.

E. J. ALBRECHT CO.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1148, H. R. 1393.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1393) for the relief of E. J. Albrecht Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MINING DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION OF MINERAL RESOURCES OF ALL PUBLIC LANDS RESERVED FOR POWER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1162, H. R. 100.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 100) to permit the mining development and utilization of mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which has been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, at the beginning of line 6, to insert "heretofore"; in line 7, after the word "sites", to strike out "by statutory rights"; on page 2, line 7, after the word "session", to insert a colon and "And provided further, That nothing contained herein shall be construed to open for the purposes described in this section any lands (1) which are included in any project operating or being constructed under a license or permit issued under the Federal Power Act or other Act of Congress, or (2) which are under examination and survey by a prospective licensee of the Federal Power Commission, if such prospective licensee holds an uncanceled preliminary permit issued under the Federal Power Act authorizing him to conduct such examination and survey with respect to such lands and such permit has not been renewed in the case of such prospective licensee more than once.

"(b) The locator of a placer claim under this act, however, shall conduct no mining operations for a period of 60 days after the filing of a notice of location pursuant to section 4 of this act. If the Secretary of the Interior, within 60 days from the filing of the

July 29, 1955

13. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Symington charged "political manipulation in the farm program in Missouri"; and Sen. Humphrey joined him in the statement (pp. 10519-29).
14. WATER POLLUTION. Sen. Duff urged water-pollution control as a means of conserving water (pp. 10529-30).
15. FARM CREDIT. H. R. 5168, the FCA bill, was made the unfinished business (p. 10546).

HOUSE - July 29

16. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956. Received the conference report on H. R. 7278 (pp. 10460-4). Attached to this Digest is a statement showing actions on the USDA items in this bill.
17. HOUSING. Passed, 396 to 3, S. 2126, the housing bill, with an amendment by Rep. Wolcott in the nature of a substitute (pp. 10444-43). The Wolcott amendment, which was agreed to by a vote of 217 to 188, does not include the provision for continuation of the farm housing program which has been authorized for administration by this Department. House and Senate conferees were appointed (pp. 10443, 10505).
18. SUGAR. Agreed to a resolution ^{to} provide for debate on H. R. 7030, to amend and extend the Sugar Act (pp. 10445-6).
19. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Began debate on H. R. 7470, to amend and extend the Defense Production Act (pp. 10445-50).
20. FARM LABOR. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 3822, which provides for a 3½ year extension (until June 30, 1959) of the Mexican farm-labor program, relieves employers of double liability for the cost of returning a worker to Mexico where the employer has paid once for such movement but the Mexican does not return and is later apprehended, and specifies that the Secretary of Labor is to obtain information on the availability of domestic workers, prevailing wage rates, and labor shortages in the area, then post publicly the number of workers to be imported (p. 10401). This bill will now be sent to the President.
21. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 2851, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, until June 30, 1957, upon request of a State Governor, to distribute to the State wheat flour and corn meal owned by CCC using Sec. 32 funds limited to \$15 million a year (p. 10402). This bill will now be sent to the President.
22. PERSONNEL. House conferees were appointed on H. R. 4048, making recommendations to the States for legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel to vote (pp. 10444-5).
23. WATER RESOURCES. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 3990, to authorize the Interior Department to investigate and report to Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of water resources of Alaska (pp. 10394-5). This bill will now be sent to the President.
24. PERSONNEL. Passed as reported H. R. 7618, to increase annuities of retired employees by 12% on the first \$1,500 and 8% thereafter up to \$4,000, with a gradual reduction in the increases until they end on Dec. 31, 1957 (pp. 10395-6).
25. WATER COMPACT. Passed as reported S. 2660, consenting to a compact among Ark.,

Tex.,

La.,/and Okla. regarding Red River basin waters (p. 10395).

The Public Works Committee reported with amendments H. R. 6256, consenting to a compact of Kans. and Okla. regarding Arkansas River Basin waters (H. Rept. 1592)(p. 10466).

26. RECLAMATION. House conferees were appointed on H. R. 5881, to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects, etc. (p. 10395). Senate conferees were appointed July 28.

Rep. Pfost spoke in favor of the Hells Canyon project (p. 10402).

Received from the Interior Department a report on the Ventura project, Calif. (H. Doc. 222); to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 10465).

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. 180, to authorize the Washita River Basin project, Okla. (H. Rept. 1582)(p. 10466).

27. SURPLUS PROPERTY; CIVIL DEFENSE. Passed as reported H. R. 7227, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to authorize disposal of surplus property for civil defense purposes (pp. 10396-7).

28. PROPERTY; TAXATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 6182, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act so as to make temporary provision for payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property transferred by RFC to other Government departments (pp. 10397-401).

29. FARM-CITY WEEK. Rep. Ashmore requested consideration of H. J. Res. 317, to provide for Farm-City Week, but Rep. King, Pa., objected (p. 10404).

30. PUBLIC LANDS; MINING. House and Senate conferees were appointed on H. R. 100, to permit the mining, development, and utilization of mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development (pp. 10445, 10530).

31. REORGANIZATION; PAPERWORK. Rep. Holifield criticized the Hoover Commission procedure in connection with the study on paperwork (pp. 10457-9).

32. WILDLIFE CONSERVATION. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported without amendment S. 756, to authorize the appropriation of accumulated receipts in the Federal-aid wildlife-restoration fund (H. Rept. 1756)(p. 10466).

33. LIBRARY SERVICES. The Education and Labor Committee reported without amendment H. R. 2840, to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas (H. Rept. 1587)(p. 10466).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX - July 29

34. SUGAR. Rep. Utt inserted the testimony of Oscar L. Chapman on the sugar bill (pp. A5612-14).

35. TOBACCO. Rep. Lankford inserted an editorial favoring purchase of Swiss products so as to enable the Swiss to purchase American tobacco (p. A5614).

36. PERSONNEL. Rep. Hoffman inserted a Saturday Evening Post article, "Loyalty Boards Can Err, but We Still Need Them"(p. A5622).

37. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Humphrey inserted a Democratic Digest article charging "pledges and hedges" regarding the farm program by the administration (pp. A5624-5).

3990) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 27, 1955.)

The conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEASING OF RESTRICTED INDIAN LANDS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 34) to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 28, 1955.)

The conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERSTATE COMPACT ON APPORTIONMENT OF THE WATERS OF THE RED RIVER

The ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2260) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Red River and its tributaries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the interests of such States in the development of the water resources of the Red River and its tributaries, and providing for an equitable apportionment among them of the waters of the Red River and its tributaries, and for matters incident thereto, upon the condition that one qualified person appointed by the President of the United States shall participate in such negotiations as chairman, without vote, representing the United States, and shall make a report to the President of the United States and the

Congress of the proceedings and of any compact entered into. Such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto until it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of the respective States, and approved by the Congress of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 5, 6, and 7, strike out the words "relating to the interests of such States in the development of the water resources of the Red River and its tributaries, and."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the words "and for matters incident thereto."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas to negotiate and enter into a compact providing for the apportionment of the waters of the Red River and its tributaries."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.)

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this compact legislation on Red River because the time has come when it is necessary. The increasing population in the Southwest has stepped up the consumption of water in this part of the United States. This water is being used in increasing quantities by the cities, towns, and villages throughout this great area of the country. During the last 12 months rainfall has been much less than normal, and the need of water for irrigation purposes and for the crops has been much more than usual. Those who have made a study of the situation feel that the time has come to take some mutual steps to properly use the waters of this stream.

I have been guided in my decision on this matter by engineers who have made a study of the local water conditions. Under this enabling act, engineers from my own State will go to work with those of other States to form an agreement which will be mutually satisfactory to each of the States involved. At a later date we will have an opportunity of studying the work accomplished and judging for ourselves as to how close we have come to our objectives.

FEDERAL COOPERATION IN NON-FEDERAL PROJECTS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Cali-

fornia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGLE, ASPINALL, O'BRIEN of New York, MILLER of Nebraska, and SAYLOR.

TO AMEND CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7618) to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the report of the committee is unanimous, and has the approval of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the ranking Republican member?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct. It is a unanimous report of the entire committee; also, it is not objected to by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that this is the bill which provides for an increase in pensions of retired civil-service employees; is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. This is the bill to provide an increase in the annuities of retired employees.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the chairman and the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for bringing this bill before us, prior to adjournment, so that we may pass it and put it into effect.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there a provision in this bill in behalf of survivors of annuitants?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. No; this bill gives an increase to retired employees of 12 percent on the first \$1,500 and 8 percent thereafter, up to \$4,000.

Mr. CANFIELD. There is nothing provided for survivors?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. No; that is not included.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say at this time that I want to express my appreciation to the committee of their efforts to look after our retired people. I commend the chairman and the committee for bringing out this legislation, even at this late date.

Mr. WIER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the bill, but does this bill have application only to retired employees?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. It applies also to employees that retire through December 31, 1957. It provides first 12 percent, and then it graduates 1 percent less in each 6-month period until December 31, 1957.

Mr. WIER. I was concerned that other employees might be included in

this bill, but it applies only to retirement, fine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (5 U. S. C. 736c), is amended

ed by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d) (1) The annuity of any person who now or hereafter is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the civil-service retirement and disability fund shall be increased, effective on the first day of the second month following enactment of this amendment or on the commencing date of the annuity, whichever is later, in accordance with the following schedule:

"If annuity commences between—	Annuity not in excess of \$1,500 shall be increased by—	Annuity in excess of \$1,500 shall be increased by—	The total increase in annuity may not exceed—
Aug. 20, 1950, and June 30, 1955.....	12 per centum.....	8 per centum.....	\$360.
July 1, 1955, and Dec. 31, 1955.....	10 per centum.....	7 per centum.....	\$300.
Jan. 1, 1956, and June 30, 1956.....	8 per centum.....	6 per centum.....	\$240.
July 1, 1956, and Dec. 31, 1956.....	6 per centum.....	4 per centum.....	\$180.
Jan. 1, 1957, and June 30, 1957.....	4 per centum.....	2 per centum.....	\$120.
July 1, 1957, and Dec. 31, 1957.....	2 per centum.....	1 per centum.....	\$60.

"The monthly installment of each annuity so increased shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

"(2) The increases provided by this subsection, when added to the annuities of retired employees, shall not operate to increase the annuities of their survivors, except that the annuity of any such survivor who becomes entitled to annuity shall be increased by the percent provided in subsection

"Schedule:

If annuity commences between	Annuity not in excess of \$1,500 shall be increased by—	Annuity in excess of \$1,500 shall be increased by—
August 20, 1920, and June 30, 1955.....	12 per centum.....	8 per centum.....
July 1, 1955, and December 31, 1955.....	10 per centum.....	7 per centum.....
January 1, 1956, and June 30, 1956.....	8 per centum.....	6 per centum.....
July 1, 1956, and December 31, 1956.....	6 per centum.....	4 per centum.....
January 1, 1957, and June 30, 1957.....	4 per centum.....	2 per centum.....
July 1, 1957, and December 31, 1957.....	2 per centum.....	1 per centum.....

Such increase in annuity shall not exceed the sum necessary to increase such annuity, exclusive of annuity purchased by voluntary contributions under the second paragraph of section 10 of this act, to \$4,000.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. GROSS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR CIVIL DEFENSE PURPOSES

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Government Operations, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7227) to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil defense purposes, to provide that certain Federal surplus property be disposed of to State and local civil defense organizations which are established by or pursuant to State law, and for other purposes.

(d) (1) of this section appropriate to the commencing date of such survivor's annuity."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after "section", strike out "7" and insert "8."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "schedule:" and the accompanying table and insert the following:

I may say that this bill was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Government Operations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand this is the measure our committee reported unanimously.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the bill which gives certain rights to the civil defense agencies to take over property?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. This is the bill which enables the Federal and State civil defense agencies to utilize property declared surplus by the Federal Government.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I will certainly not object. I congratulate the gentleman from Texas and the whole committee on getting this bill through.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (1) of section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended to read as follows: "Under such regulations as he may

prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion to donate for educational purposes, for civil defense purposes or public health purposes, including research, in any State without cost (except for costs of care and handling) such equipment, materials, books, or other supplies whether or not capitalized in a working-capital or similar fund under the control of any executive agency as shall have been determined to be surplus property and which shall have been determined under paragraphs (2), (3), or the new paragraph (6) added by section 4 of this act to this subsection to be unable and necessary for educational purposes, for civil defense purposes or public health purposes, including research. In determining whether or not property is to be donated under this subsection, no distinction shall be made between property capitalized in a working-capital fund established pursuant to section 405 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, or any similar fund, and any other property."

SEC. 2. The parenthetical expression appearing in paragraph (2) of section 203 (j) of said act is amended to read as follows: "(except surplus property donated in conformity with paragraph (3) or the new paragraph (6) added by section 4 of this act to this subsection.)"

SEC. 3. That paragraph (3) of section 203 (j) of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) In the case of surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense may determine whether such property is unable and necessary for educational activities that are of special interest to the armed services, such as maritime academies or military, naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard preparatory schools; or the Secretary of Defense may determine whether such property is usable and necessary for civil defense activities that are of special interest to the armed services such as State and local civil defense organizations which are established by or pursuant to State law. If such Secretary shall determine that such property is usable and necessary for such purposes, he shall allocate it for transfer by the Administrator to such educational or civil defense activities. If he shall determine that such property is not usable and necessary for such purposes, it may be disposed of in accordance with paragraph (2) or the new paragraph (6) added by section 4 of this act to this subsection."

SEC. 4. After the last paragraph of section 203 (j) of said act, insert the following new paragraph:

"(6) Determination whether such surplus property (except surplus property donated in conformity with paragraphs (2) or (3) of this subsection) is usable and necessary for civil defense purposes shall be made by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, who shall allocate such property on the basis of needs and utilization for transfer by the Administrator of General Services to civil defense organizations of the States, political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof which are established by or pursuant to State law, except that in any State where another agency is designated by State law for such purpose such transfer shall be made to said agency for such distribution within the State."

SEC. 5. Section 203 (k) of said act is amended as follows:

(a) By deleting the comma and the words "is authorized and directed" in the last line of subparagraph (2) (D) and by inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or".

(b) By inserting the following new subparagraph after subparagraph (2) (D):

"(E) the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, in the case of property transferred pursuant to this act to civil defense or-

[CONFERENCE COMMITTEE PRINT]

AUGUST 2, 1955

TEXT OF H. R. 5881 (AMENDED BY SUBSTITUTING THE LANGUAGE OF S. 2442) AS PASSED BY THE SENATE ON JULY 28, 1955.

In the Senate of the United States,

July 28, 1955.

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H. R. 5881) entitled “An Act to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects” do pass with the following

AMENDMENTS:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SECTION 1. The purpose of this title is to encourage State and local participation in the development of projects under the Federal reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in the development of similar projects in the seventeen western reclamation States by non-Federal organizations.

SEC. 2. As used in this title—

(a) The term “construction”, in addition to its usual meaning under the Federal reclamation laws, shall include rehabilitation and betterment.

(b) *The term “Federal reclamation laws” shall mean the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.*

(c) *The term “organization” shall mean a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a conservancy district, irrigation district, water users’ association, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar organization which has capacity to contract with the United States under the Federal reclamation laws.*

(d) *The term “project” shall mean (i) any complete reclamation or irrigation undertaking or a complete, self-contained, and distinct enterprise which may be a unit of such a larger undertaking, or a rehabilitation and betterment program for an existing irrigation project, authorized to be constructed pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws, and (ii) any similar undertaking proposal to be constructed by an organization. The term “project” shall not include any such undertaking, unit or program the cost of which exceeds \$5,000,000: Provided, That nothing contained in this definition shall preclude the making of a grant not in excess of \$5,000,000 in accordance with the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of this title, to organizations which qualify for the same and which are not applicants for a loan under this title: And provided further, That an organization shall be limited to a contract or contracts under the provisions of*

this title provided the total of the costs involved does not exceed \$5,000,000, except as otherwise herein provided.

(e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the benefits provided in this title shall submit a proposal therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a payment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining the proposal.

SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project which has not theretofore been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail comparable to those included in preauthorization reports required for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been submitted for review by the States of the stream basin in which the project is located in like manner as provided in subsection (c), section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), except that the review may be limited to the State or States in which the project is located if the proposal is one solely for rehabilitation and betterment of an existing project, and shall include a proposed allocation of capital costs to functions such that costs for facilities used for a single purpose shall be allocated to that purpose and

costs for facilities used for more than one purpose shall be so allocated among the purposes served that each purpose will share equitably in the costs of such joint facilities.

(b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that the organization already holds or can acquire all lands and interests in land (except public and other lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water necessary for the successful construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and that (except in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects) it is ready, able, and willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this title such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have advised is proper in the circumstances: Provided, That the contribution required of any applicant organization shall not be in excess of 25 per centum of the costs of the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects and irrigation facilities owned by the applicant organization shall be pledged as all or part of any security for repayment.

(c) *If the project is found by the Secretary and the Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appropriate State agency designated by him) to be financially feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this title, the Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as provided in section 5: Provided, That if any affected State shall object, pursuant to opportunity therefor afforded under the terms of the Act of December 22, 1944 (the Flood Control Act of 1944), or if the estimated cost of any project is in excess of \$500,000, no such contract shall be executed until and unless the same shall have been approved by Act of Congress, except as hereinbefore provided for rehabilitation and betterment of an existing project: Provided further, That prior to submission of any project proposal the Secretary shall afford the applicant organization an opportunity to comment in writing on the conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary with respect to the project proposal and such written comment of the applicant organization shall be included in the matter submitted to the Congress. The Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this title, may reserve from use*

or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within his administrative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and which are required for use by the project. Any such reservation shall expire at the end of two years unless the repayment contract provided for in section 5 of this title shall have been executed.

(d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to financial feasibility, emergency or urgent need for the project, whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irrigation water for an existing irrigation project, whether the proposal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irrigation or drainage. All project works and facilities constructed under this title shall remain under the ownership and control of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of the contract entered into pursuant to section 5 of this title.

SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this title shall set out, among other things—

(a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project

which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(b) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded the organization and the time and method of paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to non-reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1) the sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available; and (2) interest, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, by estimating the average annual yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations or prices during the month of May preceding the fiscal year in which the loan is made, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of such month of May, and by adjusting such estimated average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum at the beginning of the fiscal year pre-

ceding the date on which the contract is executed on that pro rata share of the loan which is attributable to furnishing irrigation benefits in each particular year to land held in private ownership on the effective date of this title by any one owner in excess of one hundred and sixty irrigable acres on existing projects; and (3) in the case of any project involving an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or commercial power produced as an element of the project and incidental to its full development, interest on the unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the loan at a rate as determined in (2) above;

(d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable functions is made, in accordance with regulations with respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal department or agency primarily concerned with those functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such regulations, for operation by the United States or for repayment to the United States of the amount of any such grant;

(e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as aforesaid. The liability of the United States under any con-

tract entered into pursuant to this title shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the same, and every such contract shall so recite;

(f) provisions conforming to the excess land requirements set forth in the third sentence of section 46 of the Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 649), if the new project or unit of a new project furnishes irrigation service; and

(g) provisions conforming to the preference requirements contained in the proviso to section 9 (c) of the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1193), if the project produces electric power for sale.

SEC. 6. Upon request of an organization which has made or intends to make a proposal under this title the head of any Federal department or agency may make available to the organization any existing engineering, economic, or hydrologic information and printed material that it may have and that will be useful in connection with the planning, design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the project concerned. As agreed upon, the reasonable cost of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the reasonable cost of making and administering any loan under this title shall, to the extent that they would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under

the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 5 of this title unless they are otherwise paid for by the organization.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this title.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,000,-000 to carry out the provisions of this title: Provided, That the Secretary shall advise the Congress promptly on the receipt of each proposal referred to in section 3 and, previous to any appropriation, shall have reported to the Congress on each proposal that has his approval, but no contracts shall be executed until the Congress shall have appropriated funds for the specific proposal covered by each contract. All appropriations authorized for the purposes of this title shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under this title, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided.

SEC. 9. This title shall be a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws.

TITLE II

SEC. 21. The purpose of this title is to encourage State and local participation in the development of non-Federal

projects similar to those described in title I and to provide for Federal assistance to non-Federal organizations under terms and conditions, so far as found practicable by the Secretary, as described in said title I in the thirty-one States (outside of the seventeen western reclamation States) and in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

SEC. 22. As used in this title—

(a) The term “construction”, in addition to its usual meaning under the Federal reclamation laws, shall include rehabilitation and betterment, drainage and control of saline water intrusion.

(b) The term “Federal reclamation laws” shall mean the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

(c) The term “organization” shall mean a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a conservancy district, irrigation district, drainage district, water users’ association, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar organization which has capacity to contract with the United States.

(d) The term “project” shall mean (i) any complete reclamation, drainage, water storage, saline water intrusion control, or irrigation undertaking or a complete, self-contained, and distinct enterprise which may be a unit of such a larger undertaking, or a rehabilitation and betterment

program for an existing irrigation project, and (ii) any similar undertaking proposed to be constructed by an organization. The term "project" shall not include any such undertaking, unit, or program the cost of which exceeds \$5,000,000: Provided, That nothing contained in this definition shall preclude the making of a grant not in excess of \$5,000,000 in accordance with the provisions of sections 24 and 25 of this title, to organizations which qualify for the same and which are not applicants for a loan under this title: And provided further, That an organization shall be limited to a contract or contracts under the provisions of this title provided the total of the costs involved does not exceed \$5,000,000, except as otherwise herein provided.

(e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 23. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the benefits provided in this title shall submit a proposal therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a payment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining the proposal.

SEC. 24. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project shall set forth; among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail and any other information required by the Secretary; shall have been submitted for review

by any States likely to be materially affected by the project.

(b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that the organization already holds or can acquire all lands and interests in land (except public and other lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water necessary for the successful construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and that (except in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects) it is ready, able, and willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this title such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have advised is proper in the circumstances: Provided, That the contribution required of any applicant organization shall not be in excess of 25 per centum of the costs of the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects and irrigation or other facilities owned by the applicant organization, as well as other assets or income of the applicant organization, may be pledged as all or part of any security for repayment.

(c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the

Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appropriate State agency designated by him) to be financially feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this title, the Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as provided in section 25: Provided, That if any affected State shall object, or if the estimated cost of any project is in excess of \$500,000, no such contract shall be executed until and unless the same shall have been approved by Act of Congress: Provided further, That prior to submission of any project proposal the Secretary shall afford the applicant organization an opportunity to comment in writing on the conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary with respect to the project proposal and such written comment of the applicant organization shall be included in the matter submitted to the Congress. The Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this title, may reserve from use or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within his administrative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and which are required for use by the project. Any such reservation shall expire at the end of two years unless the

repayment contract provided for in section 25 of this title shall have been executed.

(d) *The Secretary shall give due consideration to financial feasibility, emergency, or urgent need for the project, whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irrigation water for an existing irrigation project, whether drainage benefits are involved, whether the proposal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irrigation or drainage. All project works and facilities constructed under this title shall remain under the ownership and control of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of the contract entered into pursuant to section 25 of this title.*

SEC. 25. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 24 of this title shall set out, among other things—

(a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project;

(b) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded the organization and the time and method of paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed

as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1) the sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available; and (2) interest, at the average rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, paid on the long-term interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on which the contract is executed on that pro rata share of the loan which is attributable to furnishing domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or commercial power produced as an element of the project and incidental to its full development;

(d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable functions is made, in accordance with regulations with respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal department or agency primarily concerned with those functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such regulations, for operation by the United States or for repayment to the United States of the amount of any such grant;

(e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as aforesaid. The liability of the United States under any contract entered into pursuant to this title shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the same, and every such contract shall so recite; and

(f) provisions conforming to the preference requirements contained in the proviso to section 9 (c) of the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1193), if the project produces electric power for sale.

SEC. 26. Upon request of an organization which has made or intends to make a proposal under this title, the head of any Federal department or agency may make available to the organization any existing engineering, economic, or hydrologic information and printed material that it may have and that will be useful in connection with the planning, design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the project concerned. As agreed upon, the reasonable cost of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the reasonable cost of making and administering any loan under this title shall, to the extent that they would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered in the

provisions of the contract entered into under section 25 of this title unless they are otherwise paid for by the organization.

SEC. 27. The Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this title, and shall report the same to Congress currently.

SEC. 28. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,000,-000 to carry out the provisions of this title: Provided, That the Secretary shall advise the Congress promptly on the receipt of each proposal referred to in section 23 and, previous to any appropriation, shall have reported to the Congress on each proposal that has his approval, but no contracts shall be executed until the Congress shall have appropriated funds for the specific proposal covered by each contract. All appropriations authorized for the purposes of this title shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under this title, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 31. The planning and construction of projects undertaken pursuant to this Act shall be subject to all procedural requirements and other provisions of the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), except in the case of projects solely for rehabilitation and betterment.

SEC. 32. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person, organization, or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to persons, organizations, or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and for other purposes."



amendment continues only the exemptions for assessment fees, for personal, traveling, and subsistence expenses and for telegraph and telephone expenses.

Section 2 amends certain provisions of title 18 of the United States Code.

(1) Subsection (a) amends section 608 (a) of title 18 which provides penalties for the making of political contributions in excess of \$5,000. The amendment raises this limit to \$10,000.

(2) Subsection (b) amends section 608 (b) of title 18 so as to exempt from the prohibition contained in such section against the purchase of articles the proceeds of which inure to the benefit of a political committee, articles sold by a political committee on a nonprofit basis.

(3) Subsection (c) increases the maximums on contributions and expenditures by political committees from \$3 million to an amount equal to 20 cents multiplied by the total number of votes cast in any of the three latest presidential elections.

Section 3 (a) adds a new section 613 to title 18 of the United States Code. The new section makes it unlawful for a corporation or labor organization which is a party to a contract requiring union membership as a condition of employment to make a contribution or to make an expenditure, directly or indirectly, in connection with a Federal election, either general or primary or to make a contribution to any committee, association, or organization (whether or not political) which makes such contributions or expenditures. It also makes it unlawful to receive a contribution from such an organization. This section would to some extent parallel existing section 610 of title 18, insofar as corporations and unions having this type of contract are concerned, except that the amendment will cover indirect as well as direct expenditures and contributions.

Section 3 (b) amends section 8 (a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide an additional condition upon the right of an employee and a labor organization to enter into a union-shop contract. At the present time such a contract may be entered into only if the union is the representative of the employees and has filed certain financial statements, its officers have filed non-Communist affidavits, and the employees have not voted to deny the union the right to enter into such a contract. The amendment would require, in addition, the filing of a statement, satisfactory to the National Labor Relations Board, within 90 days prior to the effective date of the contract to the effect that the union had not made political contributions or expenditures in a Federal election (including a primary) within the preceding 24 months.

Section 4 removes from the Hatch Act the provisions relating to political activity by State employees engaged in activities financed in part by loans or grants made by the Federal Government.

Section 5 of the amendment contains the usual separability clause.

CORRECTION OF INEQUITY RESULTING FROM FIXING EFFECTIVE DATE OF PUBLIC LAW 68

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to correct the inequity resulting from the setting of the effective date of Public Law 68 of the 84th Congress.

Under Public Law 134 of the 79th Congress employees in the field postal service were paid on the basis of a 360-day year, and were paid for Saturday or Sunday whether or not service was per-

formed on those day. This resulted in an hourly rate of pay equal to the annual salary divided by 2,880 hours.

Public Law 68 of the 84th Congress authorized the Postmaster General to make the effective date of the change in pay periods and the reclassification provisions effective at any time within 180 days of enactment. Acting upon the authority granted by the act, the Postmaster General made the act effective on December 3, 1955, a Saturday. This had the effect of paying employees at the 360-day per year rate for December 1 and 2, but denying them pay for Saturday and Sunday as contemplated by Public Law 134. Public Law 68, by changing the method of payment, does not provide pay for Saturday or Sunday service. The net result was that regular employees (as distinguished from substitutes) received an hourly rate of pay for services on December 1 and 2 on the basis of a year of 2,880 hours. The average loss to each employee is something in excess of \$4.50 per day for each of these days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3077) to correct an inequity resulting from the setting of the effective date of Public Law 68 of the 84th Congress, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], my colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], I submit for appropriate reference, an amendment, intended to be proposed by us to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance

benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes.

The amendment is identical to the bill (S. 627) to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance and benefits for others who are in need through the issuance of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food products, which was introduced on January 21, 1955, by myself and the same Senators who are now joining with me as cosponsors of this amendment.

When Senate bill 627 was introduced, it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and re-referred to the Committee on Finance. I have polled the cosponsors of the original bill, and all join me in submission of the amendment. It will add a new title III to House bill 7225.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed.

THE SMALL PROJECTS BILL—CHANGE OF CONFEREES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] be excused as a Senate conferee on House bill 5881, the so-called Small Project bill, providing for State-Federal cooperation on certain reclamation projects; and that the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] be named a conferee in his stead. Naturally, this request is made with the full consent of the senior Senator from Colorado, and with the full concurrence of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] who is the other minority conferee on the measure; and is made on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and with the approval of the minority leader.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I urge that this be done; I think it is the fair thing to do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. POTTER:

Address delivered by him at salute-to-Eisenhower dinner at Chattanooga, Tenn., on January 20, 1956.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him before the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee, on January 28, 1956.

Statement on a proposed immigration policy of the United States, submitted by the national director of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

Address delivered by Representative JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., before a joint session of the Georgia General Assembly, on January 24, 1956.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Article written by him, entitled "Facts For Farmers and Other Americans," published in the Forwarded magazine for November 1955.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Suggested reading list on communism and how to combat it, prepared under the auspices of the order of Knights of Pythias.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Article and editorial honoring Mrs. O. D. Cook, veteran Oregon union organizer, published in the Oregon Labor Press of January 27, 1956.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Editorial entitled "Natural Gas in a Free Economy," published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 29, 1956, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Editorial entitled "A Farm Program That Works," published in the January 1956 issue of the New England Dairyman.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Article entitled "Messenger of Peace?" published in the Pittsburgh Press of January 26, 1956, relating to the friendly letter from Premier Bulganin to President Eisenhower on the general subject of peace.

PROPOSED SALE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED RUBBER PLANT NEAR CHARLESTON, W. VA.—TELEGRAM FROM FRANK KNIGHT

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the attention of the Senate is earnestly requested to the reading of a telegram sent to me last Friday by Mr. Frank Knight, of Charleston, W. Va., who is the managing editor of the Charleston Gazette and one of the outstanding newspapermen of the Nation. This message refers to the recently negotiated sale of the Government-owned rubber plant situated at Institute, a few miles from the capital of the State. Mr. Knight says:

Fulbright resolution of disapproval on sale of Institute plant greatest concern to all West Virginia and particularly Charleston area. Facts in sale commission's report to Congress so overwhelmingly favorable to Government that it seems incredible any opposition should develop. Goodrich-Gulf already possesses plans for enlarging its Port Neches, Tex., plant, over which there is no Government control whatever. Company merely decided to purchase Institute as alternative and quicker method of expanding its facilities. Therefore net effect of blocking pending sale to Goodrich-Gulf will not be to prevent some imaginary injury to a healthy competitive situation within industry as Fulbright hints but merely to defeat the use of a ready facility in West Virginia in favor of expansion of facilities in Texas as large as the company wants to expand them. Will you be good enough on receipt of this telegram to inform me in what special manner, if any, you believe the Gazette can be helpful in defeating the pending disapproval resolution?

Mr. President, if the people of West Virginia could officially express themselves on the important question discussed in this telegram, they would, in my opinion, unanimously vote with Mr. Knight against the disapproval resolution of which the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is the author.

It is my hope and belief that a majority of the Senate will, at the proper time, vote for and with the people of West Virginia in this case. For this anticipated service I sincerely thank my friends in the Senate in advance.

SEVENTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that today marks the 74th anniversary of the birth of our late, beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

We are still too close to the period which is inescapably associated with his name to have historical perspective. But even at this range, it is apparent to every American that he was one of the giants of all times.

He was a controversial figure—but in the sense that all great men are controversial. He was a leader of courage and conviction, and such men live constantly in the swirling tides of national and international conflict.

As one who was closely associated with our late President, I will never forget the meaning of his leadership to our country.

He became President at a time when we were dispirited, discouraged, groping, almost with a sense of hopelessness, for a way out of our difficulties. He left us with a sense of courage and a feeling of buoyancy which will never desert us in our hours of trial.

Mr. President, the verdict of history is still to be written. But however the book is finally closed, the last line must say that Franklin D. Roosevelt was a man capable of facing the terrible problems of terrible times.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today is the 74th birthday of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on this subject for approximately 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today, January 30, marks the 74th anniversary of the 31st President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is now 11 years since his death. While he was governor of New York, and, to a much greater extent, while he was President, his birthday was observed by many of his fellow citizens. It soon came to be a kind of national observance, although not under official auspices. By his strongly expressed wish, these celebrations became fund-raising events to combat the dread disease of poliomyelitis.

During the past year the world has rejoiced at the discovery of a vaccine that promises to bring this dread affliction under control. This discovery was made possible, in large part, by the March of Dimes and the efforts of our late beloved President.

Franklin Roosevelt's compassion for humanity, as well as his philosophy of government, were eloquently reflected in his great utterances and official pronouncements. Even today his words ring out with the clarity of truth and the conviction of a deep sincerity. They recall movingly the vast changes he helped

to effect, and the mighty problems which he so courageously faced in his time. It is well to recall some of them on this day, his birth date.

Do you recall, Mr. President, when he said he would lead the great fight for "the forgotten man at the bottom of the economic pyramid"? Do you recall his almost revolutionary criterion for the national growth? He said:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

Do you remember his aim to make every family independent of the degrading influence of charity and the dole? He said:

Continued dependence on relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fiber.

Do you remember his concern with those who sought selfish gain at the expense of the country? He said:

We have always known that needless self-interest was bad morals; we now know that is bad economics.

Franklin Roosevelt had words, too, for those who would close our doors to the tired, poor, and huddled masses yearning to breathe free. He said:

All of our people—except the full-blooded Indians—are immigrants, or the descendants of immigrants.

In words which will never be forgotten, and will always be associated with his name, he urged us to conquer hysteria.

He said:

The only thing we have to fear is fear itself * * * nameless, unreasoning fear.

As to foreign policy, Franklin Roosevelt called us to high purposes and performance. He mobilized the English language and the power of his personality, to save mankind from fascism. He said:

We must be the great arsenal of democracy.

And in defining our foreign policy, he said:

In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor. More than an end to war, we want an end to the beginnings of all wars.

Finally, in the last words he ever wrote, he called us to accept the challenges of the day, and to put aside our fears of the unknown.

The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today.

All these, and many more, are the noble words of a man who fully deserves to be enshrined forever in the hearts of the American people. And he has been, despite all his venomous detractors.

Franklin Roosevelt, in fact, lives on in his achievements, which have become part of the American heritage.

Last year at this time, I introduced a joint resolution, which still is pending before the Senate; it is Senate Joint Resolution 73, which would make the birthday of President Roosevelt a national holiday. I do not know what the prospects are for the passage of the joint resolution at this session. I surely hope it

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

May 24, 1956
May 23, 1956
84th-2nd, No. 85

CONTENTS

Access roads.....12	Flood protection.....33	Poultry.....39
Agricultural : appropriations.....2	Foreign aid.....7,28	Reclamation.....3
Appropriations.....2,12,14	Forests.....8,12,15,18	Recreation.....18
Civil defense.....44	Grains.....6	Roads.....21
Claims.....10	Housing.....24	Soil bank.....25
CCC.....5	Inflation.....30	Soil conservation.....27
Dairy industry.....23	Labor standards.....36	Surplus commodities..36,38
Extension service.....17	Library services.....22	Textiles.....29
Farm loans.....26	Minerals.....9	Tobacco.....41
Farm prices.....20	Monopolies.....35	Trade, foreign.....4,31
Farm program.....1,16,25	Personnel...10,13,37,42,43	Veterans' benefits...19,34
Fisheries.....15,40	Plant pests.....4	Water rights.....32
	Postal rates.....11	Wildlife.....6

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to conference report on farm bill. Ready for President. House conferees appointed on USDA appropriation bill. House committee ordered reported bill to increase CCC borrowing authority. House committee ordered reported mutual security bill. House received conference reports on bill to facilitate completion of minor reclamation projects and bill to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects. Both Houses received USDA proposed bill on regulation of interstate movement of plant pests. House committee ordered reported bill to authorize use of CCC grain for feeding wild birds. Senate passed Johnston retirement bill. Senate committee reported Commerce (continued on page 6)

HOUSE

1. FARM PROGRAM. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 10875, the farm bill, by a vote of 304 to 59. p. 7950 This bill is now ready for the President.
2. APPROPRIATIONS. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 11177, the USDA appropriation bill for 1957. p. 7960 (Senate conferees were appointed May 22.)
3. RECLAMATION. Received the conference report on H. R. 5881, to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. The conferees agreed to limit the application of this bill to the 17 Western reclamation States, to provide for authorization of projects by the appropriate Congressional committees, and to provide with modifications that local participating organizations not be required to contribute in excess of 25% of the reimbursable costs and that projects producing electric power conform to the power preference provisions of the reclamation laws (H. Rept. 2200). p. 7961
Rep. Aspinall requested and received permission for Rep. Saylor to file for inclusion in the Congressional Record a statement of his opposition to the conference report on H. R. 5881. p. 7963

Received the conference report on H. R. 6268, to provide for the use of appropriated funds by the Secretary of Interior in contracts for the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation projects (H. Rept. 2199). p. 7961

4. PLANT PESTS. Both Houses received from this Department a proposed bill to amend legislation for regulation of the movement from foreign countries into or through the U. S., and the interstate movements of plant pests; to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee and the House Agriculture Committee. pp. 7894, 7970
5. CCC. The Banking and Currency Committee ordered reported (amended) H. R. 11132, to increase the borrowing power of the CCC. p. D520
6. GRAINS. The Banking and Currency Committee ordered reported H. R. 7641, to provide for the use of surplus grains to feed certain wild birds in an effort to prevent waterfowl depredations. p. D520
7. FOREIGN AID. The Foreign Affairs Committee ordered reported H. R. 11356, to extend the Mutual Security Program. p. D520
8. FORESTRY. Rep. Laird indicated that he had received support for his bill H. R. 10794, to provide for an annual report on the administration of national forests, from conservation groups, and submitted a proposed amendment to his bill to require in the annual report, information on the need for reforestation. p. 7968
9. MINING. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 6501, to permit the disposal of certain reserve mineral deposits under the U. S. mining laws (H. Rept. 2198). p. 7970
10. PERSONNEL. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 5862, to provide jurisdiction of U. S. district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation. p. 7969 This bill is now ready for the President.
11. POSTAL SERVICE. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported H. R. 11380, to readjust postal rates. p. D521
12. APPROPRIATIONS. The Committee report (see Digest 83) on H. R. 11319, the public works appropriation bill for 1957, includes the following statements:

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

"The bill includes language providing for the use of \$6,400,000 of receipts from the sale of power for the purchase of firming energy, the rental of facilities, and the payment of wheeling charges.

"During the course of the hearings, the Committee explored extensively the possibility of service to additional preference customers, both through direct sales and through the integration of generation and distribution facilities of the potential additional customers with those of the Southwestern Power Administration. During the course of the hearings last year the Administrator used as an argument against re-implementing the original integration contracts with certain of the generating and transmission cooperatives, the hypothesis that it would take years to properly load the SPA system with additional firm power customers so that it could operate at a proper income level. These arguments failed, and this year it has become convenient for him to argue that there are now more customers than can be served, in order to

SUPPLEMENTING THE FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS BY PROVIDING FOR FEDERAL COOPERATION IN NON-FEDERAL PROJECTS AND FOR PARTICIPATION BY NON-FEDERAL AGENCIES IN FEDERAL PROJECTS

MAY 23, 1956.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ASPINALL, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 5881]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: *That the purpose of this Act is to encourage State and local participation in the development of projects under the Federal reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in the development of similar projects in the seventeen western reclamation States by non-Federal organizations.*

SEC. 2. *As used in this Act—*

(a) *The term “construction” shall include rehabilitation and betterment.*

(b) *The term “Federal reclamation laws” shall mean the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.*

(c) *The term “organization” shall mean a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a conservancy district, irrigation district, water users’ association, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar organization which has capacity to contract with the United States under the Federal reclamation laws.*

(d) The term "project" shall mean (i) any complete irrigation undertaking, including incidental features thereof, or distinct unit of such an undertaking or a rehabilitation and betterment program for an existing irrigation project, authorized to be constructed pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws and (ii) any similar undertaking proposed to be constructed by an organization. The term "project" shall not include any such undertaking, unit, or program the cost of which exceeds \$5,000,000: Provided, That any project, the estimated cost of which is more than \$5,000,000 but less than \$10,000,000, may qualify under this Act if the applicant organization is ready, able, and willing to finance otherwise than by loan or grant under this Act all costs in excess of the amount of the loan or grant which would be made under this Act if the estimated construction cost were \$5,000,000: Provided further, That nothing contained in this definition shall preclude the making of a grant not in excess of \$5,000,000 in accordance with the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of this Act, to organizations whose proposed projects qualify for the same but which are not applicants for a loan under this Act: And provided further, That nothing contained in this Act shall preclude the making of more than one loan or grant, or combined loan and grant, to an organization so long as no two such loans or grants, or combinations thereof, are for the same project, as herein defined.

(e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the benefits provided in this Act shall submit a proposal therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a payment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining the proposal.

SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project which has not theretofore been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail comparable to those included in preauthorization reports required for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been submitted for review by the States of the drainage basin in which the project is located in like manner as provided in subsection (c), section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), except that the review may be limited to the State or States in which the project is located if the proposal is one solely for rehabilitation and betterment of an existing project; and shall include a proposed allocation of capital costs to functions such that costs for facilities used for a single purpose shall be allocated to that purpose and costs for facilities used for more than one purpose shall be so allocated among the purposes served that each purpose will share equitably in the costs of such joint facilities.

(b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that the organization already holds or can acquire all lands and interests in land (except public and other lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject to disposition by him) and rights, pursuant to applicable State law, to the use of water necessary for the successful construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this Act such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have advised is proper in the circumstances: Provided, That the contribution of any applicant organization shall not be required to

be in excess of 25 per centum of the costs of the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects.

(c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appropriate State agency designated by him) to be financially feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as provided in section 5; but no such contract shall be executed by the Secretary prior to sixty calendar days (which sixty days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain) from the date on which the project proposal has been submitted to both branches of the Congress for consideration by the appropriate committees thereof, and then only if neither such committee, by committee resolution and notification in writing to the Secretary, disapproves the project proposal within such period: *Provided*, That if both such committees, in the same manner and prior to the expiration of such period, approve the project proposal, then the Secretary may proceed to execute the contract: *Provided further*, That in the event either committee disapproves the project proposal, the Secretary shall not proceed further unless the Congress has approved the same. The Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this Act, may reserve from use or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within his administrative jurisdiction and subject to the disposition by him and which are required for use by the project. Any such reservation shall expire at the end of two years unless the repayment contract provided for in section 5 of this Act shall have been executed.

(d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to financial feasibility, emergency, or urgent need for the project, whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irrigation water for an existing irrigation project, whether the proposal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irrigation. All project works and facilities constructed under this Act shall remain under the jurisdiction and control of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of the repayment contract.

SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this Act shall set out, among other things—

(a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(b) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded the organization and the time and method of paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1) the sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available; (2) interest, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, by estimating the average annual yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations or prices during the month of May preceding the fiscal year in which the loan is made, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of such month of May, and by adjusting such estimated average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on which the contract is executed, on that pro rata share of the loan which is attributable to furnishing irrigation benefits in each particular year to land held in private ownership by any one owner in excess of one hundred and sixty irrigable acres; and (3) in the case of any project involving an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or commercial power produced as an element of the project and incidental to its full development, interest on the unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the loan at a rate as determined in (2) above;

(d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable functions is made, in accordance with regulations with respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal department or agency primarily concerned with those functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such regulations, for operation by the United States or for repayment to the United States of the amount of any such grant;

(e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as aforesaid. The liability of the United States under any contract entered into pursuant to this Act shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the same, and every such contract shall so recite; and

(f) provisions conforming to the preference requirements contained in the proviso to section 9 (c) of the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1193), if the project produces electric power for sale.

SEC. 6. Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project which has theretofore been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall be made in like manner as a proposal under section 4 of this Act, but the Secretary may waive such requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of that section as he finds to be duplicative of, or rendered unnecessary or impossible by, action already taken by the United States. Upon approval of any such proposal by the Secretary he may negotiate and execute a contract which conforms, as nearly as may be, to the provisions of section 5 of this Act.

SEC. 7. Upon request of an organization which has made or intends to make a proposal under this Act, the head of any Federal department or agency may make available to the organization any existing engineering, economic, or hydrologic information and printed material that it may have and that will be useful in connection with the planning, design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the project concerned. The reasonable cost of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the cost of making and administering any loan under this Act shall, to the extent that they

would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 5 of this Act unless they are otherwise paid for by the organization.

SEC. 8. The planning and construction of projects undertaken pursuant to this Act shall be subject to all procedural requirements and other provisions of the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080).

SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act: Provided, That the Secretary shall advise the Congress promptly on the receipt of each proposal referred to in section 3, and no contract shall become effective until appropriated funds are available to initiate the specific proposal covered by each contract. All such appropriations shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under this Act, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided.

SEC. 11. This Act shall be a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws and may be cited as the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956.

SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person, organization, or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to persons, organizations, or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
A. L. MILLER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
FRANK A. BARRETT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5881) providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The major change to the House-passed bill which was agreed to and adopted by the conference committee was the restriction of the legislation to only the 17 western reclamation States. The bill as it passed the House was applicable to all 48 States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. There is a need for the type of program that this legislation authorizes in the East and South as well as the West, and this accounts for the wide support for nationwide coverage at the time the legislation was considered and passed in the House in May 1955. However, since that time the Departments of Agriculture and Interior and the Bureau of the Budget have recommended that the type of program authorized by this legislation be made available to the nonreclamation States by amendment to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566, 83d Cong.). In response to requests from Senator Anderson, chairman of the conference committee, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson advised the committee that—

The Department of Agriculture believes that the purposes sought by title II of H. R. 5881 can most successfully be accomplished by amendment to Public Law 566, 83d Congress, which will, if enacted, permit the Secretary of Agriculture to perform as an integral part of the agricultural services the purposes provided for in title II of H. R. 5881.

Bureau of the Budget Director Hughes advised the committee that—

The Bureau also recommends that the Congress defer action on title II of the bill at this time, and that legislative authority to extend Federal assistance for irrigation developments in the 31 Eastern States be enacted separately from H. R. 5881. The Secretary of Agriculture will recommend to the Congress the extent to which such Federal assistance is required, and the terms and conditions under which it should be extended.

and Assistant Secretary of the Interior Aandahl advised that—

Consideration of the differences between the two versions and of the problems involved in integrating operations under either of them with operations under the Water Facilities Act and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act leads us to join the Bureau of the Budget and the Department

of Agriculture in recommending that coverage of the Eastern States in H. R. 5881 be deleted.

The Department of Agriculture is apparently disturbed over the prospect of administering two similar programs under separate legislation.

In addition to these expressions from the administration, another action—even more important to the conference committee's consideration—has taken place. Recently, the House passed H. R. 8750, which would amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, and this legislation is presently pending in the Senate. Enactment of H. R. 8750 or similar legislation would give the nonreclamation areas of the Nation a program similar to that provided by H. R. 5881 but without the problems inherent in attempting to administer basic reclamation legislation in nonreclamation States.

Under these circumstances, the conference committee considered it appropriate that the "small projects" local participation program provided under H. R. 5881 should be limited to the reclamation States.

Another significant change to the House-passed bill adopted by the conference committee relates to the authorization procedure. The bill as it passed the House would have required the Secretary to submit project proposals which he approved to both branches of the Congress and to not execute a contract covering any proposal prior to 60 days following such submission. This procedure would permit the review of the proposals by the Congress but it would not provide for approval or disapproval of such proposals. The conference committee retained this provision but extended it to provide for approval or disapproval by the appropriate House and Senate committees within the 60-day period. If either committee should disapprove a project proposal, approval by the Congress would be required before the Secretary could execute the contract.

With respect to the requirement that the applicant organization finance a portion of the project cost, the conference committee adopted, with some modification, the provision in the Senate-passed bill that the organization not be required to contribute in excess of 25 percent of the reimbursable costs.

The conference committee also adopted one other provision in the Senate-passed bill which requires that, where a project produces electric power or energy for sale, the contract for such project include provisions conforming to the power preference provisions of reclamation law. Because of the limitation in the size of the projects, and the treatment of power in the legislation as an incidental purpose, it is not expected that this "small projects" program will result in any appreciable power production for disposal by the organizations. The organizations themselves are preference customers under the law.

In all other major respects, the conference committee agreed to and adopted language in the House-passed bill.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
A. L. MILLER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 13, 1956
For actions of June 12, 1956
84th-2nd, No. 97

CONTENTS

Administration.....25	Federal-State relations.....26	Poultry.....9
Appropriations.....3,17	Foreign aid.....16	Property.....1,29
Atomic energy.....12	Foreign trade.....5,18	Reclamation.....4,24
Civil defense.....29	Forestry.....1,2,11,14	Seed.....6
Dairy industry.....18,23	Homesteaders.....2	St. Lawrence Seaway.....13
Disaster relief.....2	Lands.....1,2	Surplus commodities.....18
Distressed areas.....20	Loans.....2	Transportation.....28
Education.....10	Milk.....23	Veterans' benefits...19,27
Electrification.....22	Monopolies.....15	Water.....22
Experiment stations.....1	Personnel.....21	Watersheds.....1
Extension work.....7		

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated conference report on bill to provide Federal assistance to small irrigation projects. House received conference report on Commerce appropriation bill. Senate subcommittee ordered reported bills to establish town-sites from national forests, establish forest experiment station in N. Dak., and broaden present authority for use and occupancy of land within national forests. Senate committee ordered reported bill to transfer Puerto Rican hurricane relief funds to USDA. House committee ordered reported bill to amend Public Law 480. House subcommittee ordered reported bill to provide civil penalties for violations of Federal Seed Act.

SENATE

1. THE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY SUBCOMMITTEE on Soil Conservation and Forestry ordered reported to the full committee the following bills: (p. D609)

H.R. 426, without amendment, providing for the establishment of townsites from national forests or land administered under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

S. 2900, without amendment, providing for the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station in N. Dak.

S. 2216, with amendment, to amend the act of March 4, 1915, to permit the use and occupancy of national forest lands for industrial and commercial purposes, and by States or political subdivisions for constructing facilities for education or other public uses.

S. 3133, with amendment, providing for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Boise, Idaho.

The "Daily Digest" states that "the subcommittee agreed to hold hearings at dates in the near future on S. 1359, regarding consent of congressional committees for sale of certain lands acquired by U. S. under title III of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and S. 3727, to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act." p. D609

2. THE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ordered reported the following bills: (p. D610)

H.R. 8385, without amendment, to transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture the responsibilities relating to Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans.

S. 3512, without amendment, to permit desert-land entries on disconnected tracts of lands which, in the case of any one entryman, form a compact unit and do not exceed in the aggregate 320 acres.

S. 3665, with amendment, to allow a homesteader settling on unsurveyed public land in Alaska to make single final proof prior to survey of the lands.

S. 3743, with amendment, to transfer certain land from the Lassen National Forest to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif.

HOUSE

3. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on H.R. 10899, the Commerce Department and related agencies appropriation bill for 1957 (H. Rept. 2344). pp. 9070, 9105

Rep. Rabaut requested and received permission for the conference committee to file a report on H.R. 10003, the D. C. appropriation bill for 1957, by not later than Tues., June 12 midnight. p. 9067

4. RECLAMATION. Began debate on the conference report on H.R. 5881, to provide Federal assistance to local irrigation districts, water districts, and other public agencies in the construction of small projects, but deferred a vote until Wed., June 13. pp. 9068, 9071

5. FOREIGN TRADE. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported H.R. 11708, to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, after a consideration of H.R. 11403 and H.R. 11443, similar bills. p. D611

Rep. Bailey criticized a proposal to finance surveys on the effect of tariff policies on domestic industries by Federal funds, and inserted a letter questioning the completeness of a Minnesota survey of this nature. p. 9103

6. SEED. The Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee ordered reported to the full committee S. 1688, to remove the criminal penalty for inadvertent violations of the Federal Seed Act and to prescribe civil penalties for such violations of the Act. p. D611

7. EXTENSION WORK. Rep. Dixon paid tribute to the 24th National 4-H Club Camp and commended the 4-H clubs for their activities. p. 9092

8. DAIRYING. Rep. Dixon cited the publication, Dairy Situation, for indicating that cash receipts from dairy products would be above the 1955 level. p. 9092

9. POULTRY. Rep. Rogers, Mass., criticized the importation of certain poultry products from Argentina and Canada as being detrimental to Mass. poultry producers. p. 9094

10. EDUCATION. Received from HEW a proposed bill "to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State Committees on Education Beyond the High School"; to the Education and Labor Committee. p. 9105

11. FORESTRY. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H.R. 9974, to authorize the cutting of timber, the manufacture and sale of lumber, and the preservation of the forests on the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wis. (H. Rept. 2331). p. 9105

carbon dioxide into the various constituents of green plant life such as sugar. With this clearer understanding of the process scientists have actually been able by the use of certain chemicals to almost treble the amount of sugar produced by a certain form of plant. From this, for example, it is apparent that great strides have been made in unlocking the secret of how nature produces chlorophyll.

The infestation of parts of Florida by the screw-worm fly is causing an estimated loss of \$10 million worth of livestock a year. The application of the techniques used in the eradication of this pest from a badly infested island if they can be successfully applied on the mainland will offset the cost of doing it, and prevent the spread of this highly destructive insect.

The full transcript of last week's hearing will be made available to the public in the very near future and it is my hope that through the wide dissemination of this committee print people everywhere will become more aware of the great and invaluable contribution to mankind being made by the peaceful applications of atomic energy.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1957, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FLAG DAY EXERCISES

(Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the Flag Day ceremonies that will be held here in the well of the House on Thursday, June 14, in commemoration of Flag Day and the second anniversary of the inclusion of the words "Under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. We promise you an excellent program.

The House will recess for the presentation of an interservice choral group, an honor guard, and the colors. It is hoped that a full membership will be in attendance on Flag Day.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

(Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, there is talk in the air that we shall adjourn in mid-July. I think it is only fair that I should inform the House that I shall not

vote to adjourn until the civil rights bill, now bottled up in the Rules Committee, is brought to the floor of the House. Furthermore, I shall demand a record roll-call on adjournment so that every Member of the House is put on record. Whatever the platform planks of the two great political parties may say about civil rights, it will be all hogwash if from both sides of the aisle of this House enough signatures cannot be obtained to the discharge petition to bring the issue squarely out in the open while the 84th Congress is in session.

Who is holding back? Now is the time for square talking and above-the-board dealing. I am informed that all the Democratic Members from Illinois have signed the discharge petition. Let someone speak with authority for the Republican Members from Illinois. Let others speak with authority for the State delegations, both Democratic and Republican, of the other States. This is a moral, not a partisan, issue. It would be violative of every tradition of this body and indeed of the very spirit of legislative representation if we should fold up shop and return home before we have faced on this floor the greatest moral issue of our generation.

SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dulles again exemplified his talent for improvident statements. He shocked neutral nations like India, Ireland, Sweden, and Indonesia by calling neutrality obsolete and immoral.

Now all the good President Sukarno's visit did was thus dissipated.

Nehru is due July 7 to visit with the President. I suggest Nehru's visit be postponed. The President probably could not see him then and Nehru should not be compelled to take a poor substitute and thus confront Mr. Dulles who labels Nehru's India as immoral. His visit would be abortive at its threshold.

As a friend of India, I say, "Come later, Mr. Nehru, if you cannot see the President. Postpone your visit."

The strange part of the situation is that Mr. Dulles had cleared his speech at the White House, despite its inconsistency with the President's views at his last press conference that he saw no real harm in neutrality.

Apparently the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing.

The President discards the unfair theory that if one is not with us he is against us.

Dulles still adheres to this unrealistic if not dangerous notion.

I include in the Appendix a statement by Walter Lippmann which appears in today's Post and Times Herald.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

SAFE DRIVING

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and to include an article from the Lowell Sun.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the award of winners of Chrysler's four-star driver awards for safe taxicab driving were given a trip to Washington yesterday. The safety awards are made to the most outstanding taxicab drivers in the entire country.

The Chrysler four-star driver award was given to John L. Michael for safety, courtesy, citizenship, and service.

Mr. Speaker, I wish every school in the Nation could hear the story of a man named John L. Michael, from Lowell, Mass., in my own district, who has driven an automobile for 41 years and never has had a chargeable action against him in all that time. Mr. Michael is 57 years old, and 23 years he has spent driving a taxicab. Much of that time has been with the Diamond Yellow Cab Taxi Service at Lowell. He is known also for his extreme courtesy and efficiency. Lowell is very proud of him.

I wish that every child in every school in the country could be told this story, and that the story could be printed and placed in every school.

Only 2 days ago the son of one of our most valued employees was critically injured by a teen-age driver who was driving at 80 miles an hour. If the children could be told the story about John Michael—this outstanding taxicab driver—they might be careful and would want to live up to his record.

It is only thoughtlessness that makes them reckless drivers. They do not mean to hurt and kill.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 65 I am recorded as being absent. I was present and voted "yea," and I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DOING BUSINESS WITH COMMUNISTS

(Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

WHY IS AMERICA DISLIKED?

(Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by M. Raymond Cartier which is, literally translated, entitled "Why Americans Are Detested in the Entire

World." I trust that the Members of this House will read the article with care, as it has many very useful suggestions. It also brings to mind the truth of that great and old adage, "Lord, leave me to my enemies but defend me from my friends." I understand on good authority that M. Cartier claims to be a great friend as well as an understanding one of the United States.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Territories of the House Interior Committee may meet this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

Andersen,	Fogarty	Machrowitz
H. Carl	Fulton	Mailliard
Anfuso	Gamble	Morrow
Ashmore	Garmatz	Miller, Calif.
Barden	George	Morrison
Bell	Gray	Nelson
Boland	Hale	O'Hara, Ill.
Bolton,	Halleck	O'Hara, Minn.
Oliver P.	Hays, Ohio	Phillips
Brooks, Tex.	Healey	Powell
Byrne, Pa.	Hoffman, Ill.	Prouty
Cannon	Holtzman	Reed, N. Y.
Carnahan	Hope	Rhodes, Ariz.
Christopher	Horan	Richards
Chudoff	Hyde	Rivers
Cooley	Jackson	Shelley
Coudert	Jensen	Sisk
Curtis, Mass.	Kee	Thompson, La.
Dawson, Ill.	Kelley, Pa.	Thornberry
Diggs	King, Calif.	Tumulty
Donovan	Lane	Velde
Dorn, S. C.	McConnell	Wickersham
Dowdy	McDowell	Williams, N. J.
Eberharter	McIntire	Willis
Fjare	McMillan	Wilson, Calif.
Flood		Zelenko

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-eight Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 23, 1956.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRESTON). The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the small-projects bill which passed the House on May 28, I believe, of last year.

The purpose of this bill is to provide Federal assistance to local irrigation districts, water districts, and other public agencies in the construction of small projects.

The effect of the bill would be to permit the local agencies to build the small projects themselves rather than the Bureau of Reclamation, using the same funds the Bureau could use for that purpose; but, in my opinion, less of those funds, because local agencies can build small projects more cheaply.

This legislation has twice passed the House of Representatives, having passed the House in the preceding Congress under the authorship of the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, the then chairman of the House Committee on Interior, Dr. MILLER, where it failed of passage in the Senate in the last few days.

It again passed the House by a substantial vote in the spring of last year. When the bill was reported from our committee it applied the provisions for the benefit of small projects to all of the 48 States and was amended in the House to provide that with reference to those States, outside of the 17 Western reclamation States—that is, the 31 Southern and Eastern States—the act should be administered by the Department of Agriculture rather than the Department of the Interior.

The bill went over to the other side and the Senate struck out all of the provisions of the House bill and substituted a bill of its own containing two titles. The first title applied only to the 17 Western States and was substantially the bill which passed the House. Title II of the bill provided for operation of the law with reference to the 31 Eastern and Southern States under the Department of Agriculture, although by its terms it was applicable to the entire 48 States. In other words, in the other body the bill was rewritten. Title I applied to the 17 Western States, being in effect the measure passed by this House. The other States were then segregated and put in title II under the administration of the Department of Agriculture with substantially different terms and conditions relating to the type of projects which qualified for Federal as-

sistance and the type of aid that would be given.

The House disagreed to the Senate amendments and asked for a conference during the latter part of the last session, but in the crowded situation that existed at that time we found it impossible to work out the differences between the two houses; therefore, the conference was adjourned over until this session.

In the interim, however, a request was sent to the various executive agencies to determine what their views were of the bill as written in two titles by the Senate and more particularly that portion which was included in title II and which applied to the 31 Eastern and Southern States. The various departments responded. The Department of Agriculture filed its report on January 9, 1956, as did the Department of the Interior on January 11, 1956, and the Bureau of the Budget on January 9, 1956. Each one of those agencies recommended that title II, relating to the operation of this small-project program under the Department of Agriculture, be stricken from the bill and be handled in separate legislation.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. GAVIN. I just wanted an explanation of why they disagreed.

Mr. ENGLE. I will be glad to elaborate on that part.

The Bureau of the Budget stated:

The Bureau also recommends that the Congress defer action on title II of the bill at this time and that the legislative authority to extend Federal assistance for irrigation development in the 31 Eastern States be enacted separately from H. R. 5881. The Secretary of Agriculture will recommend to the Congress the extent to which Federal assistance is required and the terms and conditions under which it should be extended.

The Department of Agriculture said:

The Department of Agriculture believes that the purposes sought in title II of H. R. 5881—

Which is the bill before you—

can most successfully be accomplished by amendment to Public Law 566, 83d Congress—

Which, by the way, is the Watershed Protection Act—

which will, if enacted, permit the Secretary of Agriculture to perform as an integral part of the agricultural services the purposes provided for in title II of H. R. 5881.

The Department of the Interior was a little more explicit on the point, saying:

Considering the differences between the two versions and the problems involved in integrating operations under either of them with operations under the Water Facilities Act and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, leads us to join the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Agriculture in recommending that coverage of the Eastern States in H. R. 5881 be deleted. This recommendation is made without prejudice to later consideration when the various problems inherent in the proposal have been satisfactorily resolved.

Now, subsequent to that time, as I was about to say, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] introduced a separate bill, and it was brought before this House and passed the House of Representatives

some weeks ago. That bill is presently pending in the Committee on Public Works in the Senate. During the debate on that bill, which was the direct result of these departmental recommendations that these two matters be segregated and the projects under the Department of Agriculture be handled separately from the consideration of those under the Department of the Interior, Mr. HOPE, the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Agriculture, said this on page 6161 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24, 1956, when the Poage bill was under consideration. The Poage bill, for the purpose of the record, is H. R. 8750. He said:

It has been a disturbing thing to the Department of Agriculture to find that they would be compelled to administer two programs, each authorized by a separate piece of legislation, which, in a sense, would be competing with each other.

He was referring to the Watershed Protection Act and the Water Facilities Act, both of which are administered under the Department of Agriculture.

Continuing, he said:

This legislation will clarify that matter, and I assume in the conference between the two Houses on the small-projects bill the conflicting matter will be eliminated.

I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who is the author of H. R. 8750, the bill relating to the Department of Agriculture pending in the other body now, for the purpose of implementing the reports filed by Agriculture, Interior, and the Budget, and he is in agreement, too, that it would be just as well to eliminate title II from this bill.

The Poage bill is somewhat different in its terms than Senate title II which was tacked onto the bill presently before you. The suggestion was made that it might be possible to put the Poage bill into this conference report. There were certain questions which arose in connection with that which made it impossible for us to do it; not only the parliamentary matters involved, that is, taking the House-passed bill which came out of a different committee and in effect legislating in a conference committee to put that bill into the conference report, but in addition to that, the separate bill by the gentleman from Texas is presently pending over in the Senate where it was first referred to the Committee on Agriculture and subsequently to the Committee on Public Works. The Members can understand that there is a grave question of propriety of a committee of Congress taking over somebody else's bill, putting it in a conference report, and thereby depriving the regularly established committees of the other body of the consideration of that measure.

So the conference report which we have brought back has the complete concurrence of the Members of the conference of the two bodies, except for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], who does not join in this report and Senator LONG, who on the Senate side did not join—4 Members of the House and 4 Members of the Senate joined in the conference report. This conference

report strikes out the title II part of the Senate bill and substitutes what is in effect the bill passed by the House in May of last year applying only to the 17 Western States. The remainder will be taken care of in the separate legislation authored by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] voted through this House and now pending in the other body.

So the conference report before us today is for all practical purposes the same measure that the House passed in May of last year limited to the 17 Western States. There are no really significant changes except for 1 or 2 smaller items that were referred to in the statement read of the managers on the part of the House with reference to certain of the details in the handling of these projects when they come before the Congress of the United States.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. I am sorry I did not hear the complete statement made by the gentleman from California. As he probably knows, I am very much interested in the Poage bill. May I ask, did the managers on the part of the Senate, in the conference committee, give the gentleman from California any assurance that they would support the Poage bill as it was sent over to the Senate, if it were deleted from this conference report?

Mr. ENGLE. It is very difficult for me, as chairman, to refer to what happened in the conference itself; but I would say to the gentleman that it is my opinion that all members of the conference will support the Poage bill in the Senate and that every effort will be made to get the Poage bill out of the committee in the Senate, get it to the floor of the Senate and send it down to the White House simultaneously with this bill. I say, without referring to anything that went on in the conference itself, that it is my opinion that that will be done. For my own part, I will say to the gentleman that I do favor the Poage bill and any assistance that I can give in getting it enacted into law, I intend to do. That was everybody's understanding. There is no conflict between us here. I discussed this matter with Mr. POAGE and he is satisfied with this conference report and the action that we took.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to say to the gentleman that just because Mr. POAGE is satisfied is not any reason why a great many of us are satisfied because, even though the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Texas are satisfied, that is not any reason why we should vote \$100 million to 17 States, eliminating the other 31 States in the East. It does not make sense to me. The gentleman says that the Senate may consider the bill. Surely, they may consider it. But with the heavy schedule ahead and in the rush that will develop, it may never even get anywhere in the Senate.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman must keep in mind that there are some things that one can do in a conference and other things that one cannot do. I have tried

to explain to the gentleman the difficulty we had due to the fact that we had a separate House-passed bill dealing precisely with that very subject matter, introduced in and passed by this House pursuant to the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. Is it not true that the 31 States about which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is so much concerned, are adequately protected under the Poage bill that passed the House?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct. They all want that bill. The problem which arose and on which there has been some discussion by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], and I assume concurred in by his colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], is that we did not hook the two of them together; and I tried to say that it just was not possible to do it.

Mr. GAVIN. It would be very satisfactory if the Poage bill were up here today. I heartily concur in the suggestion that the legislation is important. I should like to see it passed, but I do not want the other 31 States bypassed. The gentleman can give us no assurance that the Senate is going to take favorable action. I am interested in the East, as other people are interested in the Northwest. We, too, should participate in these programs that make great contributions to the conservation of our water supply in our economic and industrial life.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the gentleman withhold for just a minute for me to make this comment? His colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, was a part of the conference. He knows what discussions occurred there. I am perfectly sure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] will be glad to discuss that with his colleague, but I cannot stand here on the floor, as the gentleman well knows, and discuss matters that occurred in the conference.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I call to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the big difference between the Poage bill and this bill here is that the money involved in this bill will go to the local groups, who will repay it to the Treasury of the United States. Under the Poage bill, the hundreds of millions of dollars that go to the other States are not reimbursable to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I say that, knowing the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and knowing of his past record and stand, certainly the gentleman does not want to make it appear as though he concurred in the recommendations of the conferees, even if he was in the conference.

Mr. ENGLE. I made no such implication.

Mr. GAVIN. I doubt very much, knowing him as I do, that he would be taking such a position. I presume he was in the minority and, therefore, there was nothing he could do except to protest. If the group was in agreement, well, he might take the position, but he did not get anywhere. No doubt he will tell us of his position on the matter.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman raised a question as to what the other body was going to do with this legislation and with reference to whether or not there was a good faith intention to press the Poage bill on the other side. That is the matter to which I was referring and on which the gentleman can certainly secure adequate information.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. YOUNG. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us the relationship between the small-projects bill and the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act. Does the small-projects bill purport to amend or supersede in any way the rehabilitation and betterment legislation now on the books?

Mr. ENGLE. As far as I know, it does not. It is separate legislation that deals with physically small projects, permitting local agencies to build projects of that character themselves rather than have the Bureau of Reclamation do them more expensively. There is no project which is authorized by this bill which cannot be built under present reclamation law, but we think more of them will be built, and be built more cheaply, if this bill goes into effect.

Mr. YOUNG. One more question regarding the size of the project. I notice that the upper limitation is \$5 million except in certain cases where projects between \$5 and \$10 million could qualify, providing the applying organization financed all costs in excess of what the charge would be if the project cost \$5 million. To take a specific case, assume there was a \$9-million project, one-third flood control, one-third reclamation, and one-third power. Would this mean a participating organization would receive one-third of \$5 million, for example, for flood control, or would it be \$3 million, the relationship to the overall cost of \$9 million?

Mr. ENGLE. It is only contemplated that the total amount of money which can be advanced in non-interest-bearing loans total not in excess of \$5 million for any one project. If there are nonreimbursables in the project, they are non-repayable as they are presently under the law.

Mr. YOUNG. Is the overall project reduced to \$5 million for the purpose of determining the participation by the Federal Government with the local agencies? I notice in the legislation it is stated that the upper limit is \$5 million. There are certain projects between five and ten million that may qualify, providing the organization will finance all costs in excess of what would be required, the \$5 million.

Mr. ASPINALL. In excess of \$5 million. That was the provision in the first bill as it went through the House. That

provision is in there. I think the chairman should explain the question of the procedure in reporting back to the Congress on projects over a certain amount. I think that would be of benefit.

Mr. ENGLE. We have been very careful in this bill to give control to the Congress itself of these small projects. That matter is referred to on page 7 of the conference report in the third paragraph, which I will read:

Another significant change to the House-passed bill adopted by the conference committee relates to the authorization procedure. The bill, as it passed the House, would have required the Secretary to submit project proposals which he approved to both branches of the Congress and to not execute a contract covering any proposal prior to 60 days following such submission. This procedure would permit the review of the proposals by the Congress but it would not provide for approval or disapproval of such proposals. The conference committee retained this provision but extended it to provide for approval or disapproval by the appropriate House and Senate committees within the 60-day period. If either committee should disapprove a project proposal, approval by the Congress would be required before the Secretary could execute the contract.

This is important because it gives the Congress a chance to look these projects over. The Secretary of the Interior cannot sit down and parcel out these projects without any surveillance by the congressional committees. The Committee on Appropriations first passes on the amount of money and the authorizing committee has the right to review and reject the project. If the authorizing committee reviews and rejects the project by resolution thereupon the project cannot be built unless it is authorized by the Congress. That is an important provision it seems to me and it is the one to which the gentleman referred.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRESTON). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 67]

Andersen,	Eberharter	Lipscomb
H. Carl	Fjare	McConnell
Anfuso	Fulton	McIntire
Ashmore	Gamble	McMillan
Bell	Garmatz	Machrowicz
Betts	George	Mailliard
Bolton,	Gray	Mason
Oliver P.	Hale	Miller, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.	Halleck	Mollohan
Cannon	Hays, Ohio	Morrison
Carlyle	Healey	Nelson
Carnahan	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.
Christopher	Hoffman, Mich.	O'Neill
Chudoff	Holtzman	Patman
Cooley	Hope	Phillips
Coudert	Horan	Powell
Curtis, Mass.	Jackson	Prouty
Dawson, Ill.	Jensen	Reed, N. Y.
Denton	Kee	Rhodes, Ariz.
Diggs	Kelley, Pa.	Richards
Dondero	King, Calif.	Riehlman
Dorn, S. C.	Krueger	Rivers
Dowdy	Lane	Robison, Ky.

Rogers, Fla.	Vanik	Williams, N. J.
Sisk	Velde	Wolverton
Thompson, La.	Vorys	Zelenko
Thornberry	Wainwright	
Tumulty	Wickersham	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 350 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 10899, the Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1957.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2344)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10899) "making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 4, 5, 15, 25, and 26.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 12, 13, 24, 27, 29, 30, and 31, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "one hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$126,804,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$16,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$960,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$82,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "\$15,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$15,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 22, 23, and 28.

PRINCE H. PRESTON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
JOHN F. SHELLEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
FRANK T. BOW,
EDWARD T. MILLER,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
WARREN MAGNUSON,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
STYLES BRIDGES,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10899) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the ac-

companying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

General administration

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$2,450,000 instead of \$2,425,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,465,000 as proposed by the Senate, and eliminate language inserted by the Senate providing funds to be expended upon the certificate of the Secretary.

The conferees concur in the statement contained in the Senate committee report concerning the handling of personnel transfers to the Office of the Under Secretary for Transportation.

Bureau of the Census

Amendment No. 3—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$7,475,000 instead of \$7,413,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,575,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4—Census of governments: Appropriates \$1,750,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$2,100,000 as proposed by the Senate. The action of the conferees is not intended to reduce any of the functions proposed under this program.

Amendment No. 5—National housing inventory: Appropriates \$1,000,000 for a survey of housing as proposed by the House instead of \$650,000 for a national intercensal survey of housing as proposed by the Senate.

Civil Aeronautics Administration

Amendment No. 6—Operation and regulation: Authorizes the replacement of 100 passenger motor vehicles instead of 90 as proposed by the House and 110 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7—Operation and regulation: Appropriates \$126,804,000 instead of \$125,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$128,608,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to by the conferees includes the sum of \$108,000 to permit continued operation of 39 intermediate landing fields scheduled for discontinuance in the coming year.

Amendment No. 8—Establishment of air navigation facilities: Appropriates \$40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$37,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Civil Aeronautics Board

Amendment No. 9—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$4,625,000 instead of \$4,550,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10—Payments to air carriers: Appropriates \$16,200,000 instead of \$15,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$17,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Amendment No. 11—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$10,900,000 instead of \$10,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,020,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—Construction of a surveying ship: Appropriates \$3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Business and Defense Services Administration

Amendment No. 13—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$6,900,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$7,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Business Economics

Amendment No. 14—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$960,000 instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Maritime activities

Amendment No. 15—Ship construction: Reinstates House language authorizing reconditioning and betterment of one ship in the national defense reserve fleet which was stricken by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17—Ship construction: Appropriates \$82,700,000 instead of \$54,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$108,880,000 as proposed by the Senate, and approves \$1,115,000 for transfer to salaries and expenses instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,232,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The appropriation agreed to by the conferees includes \$2,300,000 for the conversion of two mariners for the American President Lines, \$65,000,000 for the ship replacement program, \$10,000,000 for acquisition of replaced ships, \$4,000,000 for research and development, and \$1,400,000 for administrative and warehouse expenses.

Amendment No. 18—Operating differential subsidies: Approves 2,040 voyages instead of 2,000 as proposed by the House and 2,075 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 19, 20, and 21—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$15,350,000 instead of \$15,187,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes \$6,500,000 for administrative expenses, instead of \$6,482,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,600,000 as proposed by the Senate, and \$1,600,000 for maintenance of shipyards and reserve training facilities and operation of warehouses, instead of \$1,445,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Inland Waterways Corporation

Amendment No. 22—Reported in disagreement.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 23—Construction of facilities: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE II—THE PANAMA CANAL

Amendment No. 24—Panama Canal Company: Authorizes \$3,679,000 for general and administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,562,100 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26—Panama Canal Company: Authorize the purchase of not to exceed 18 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the House.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Amendment No. 27—St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Authorizes \$325,000 for administrative expenses instead of \$315,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28—St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 29—St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Authorizes the purchase of four passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of three as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 30 and 31—Salaries and expenses, Small Business Administration: Appropriates \$1,900,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,890,000 as proposed by the House, and authorize the transfer of \$4,634,000 from the revolving fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,610,000 as proposed by the House.

PRINCE H. PRESTON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
JOHN F. SHELLEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
FRANK T. BOW,
EDWARD T. MILLER,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

SUPPLEMENTAL FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that some Members were taken from

other matters in connection with this quorum call, but I would like to use the opportunity while they are here to restate the basic proposition that is before the House, and that is that this small-projects bill comes back here limited to the 17 Western States, because the House of Representatives a few weeks ago passed separate legislation under the authorship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], which puts the administration of small projects in other areas of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture; that bill is currently pending over in the Senate. It was not possible to sit and legislate as a conference committee with legislation in separate bills pending before the Senate, which had already passed the House, and to include that legislation then in this conference report.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman from California has well stated the situation. Some of the friends of this program, some of those who have been deeply interested in establishing a program all over the United States that would enable people in all parts of the country to enjoy the advantages of local irrigation and other water uses, have felt that if we passed this conference report today before we passed the bill that the Committee on Agriculture brought you some time ago and is now pending in the Senate, that we would be jeopardizing the opportunity to extend this program nationwide.

I think that is a mistake because I believe, if we pass this conference report and make the Engle bill applicable to the 17 Western States, that we have then given them a needed tool with which to work out their problem; that if we can then pass the small watersheds bill, as brought out by the Committee on Agriculture, we will have provided an effective tool for all of the United States; and that between the two we will have a very effective program of water utilization throughout the country.

I know that there are those who say that if you pass this bill you will get no help in passing a watersheds bill. That has not been my experience with the gentleman who now stands before you and those who have worked with him on this bill. I think that we may certainly assume that we will have all the support and all the cooperation that it is possible for them to give us.

I know that in the other body there is a considerable feeling that possibly they might even hold up action on this conference report until such time as they have had an opportunity at least to pass upon the watersheds bill in their committee and determine whether or not they were going to consider it there on the floor. They have that opportunity and I think we may rely upon them to use it intelligently. I do not think we should put ourselves in the position of forcing them to do something that they do not want to do. But I believe that we may rely upon them to do the intelligent thing, and by doing it we will have a well-rounded program.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman, and certainly he is correct. The problem develops from the fact that one portion of this program is administered under the Department of the Interior and the other under the Department of Agriculture. Each of those departments recommended separate legislation, concurred in by the Bureau of the Budget. When the separate legislation was passed by the House it preempted that field, so far as that legislation was concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. If the conference report before us today is approved and if the Poage watersheds bill is approved and still it develops that the effort to get an adequate local irrigation program for the States that are not in the present reclamation program is not successful, is it the idea of the gentleman from California that his committee would be receptive to correcting any defects that might develop in the coming year that could not be handled by legislation from the Committee on Agriculture; that is, if it develops that it is necessary for us to bring in the Department of the Interior in the Eastern States into this program, how would the gentleman react to that?

Mr. ENGLE. We tried to do that. Our original bill included the 48 States under the Department of Agriculture. If you have trouble with the Poage bill we will amend this law to put you in.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 68]

Andersen,	Garmatz	Miller, N. Y.
H. Carl	George	Morrison
Ashmore	Gray	Nelson
Bell	Hale	O'Hara, Minn.
Betts	Halleck	Phillips
Boggs	Hays, Ohio	Powell
Bolton,	Healey	Prouty
Oliver P.	Hébert	Rains
Byrne, Pa.	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Cannon	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Carnahan	Hoffman, Mich.	Richards
Chudoff	Holtzman	Rivers
Cooley	Horan	Robison, Ky.
Coudert	Jackson	Sieminski
Curtis, Mass.	Jensen	Sisk
Dawson, Ill.	Kean	Spence
Deane	Kee	Thompson, La.
Diggs	Kelley, Pa.	Thornberry
Dondero	Krueger	Tumulty
Dorn, S. C.	Lane	Velde
Dowdy	McConnell	Vorys
Eberhart	McIntire	Wainwright
Fjare	Machrowicz	Wickersham
Fogarty	Maillard	Williams, N. J.
Fulton	Mason	Wolverton
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Zelenko

The SPEAKER. Three hundred fifty-one Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California will proceed.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the quorum call I was answering a question by the gentleman from Mississippi preparatory to getting around to yielding some time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] which I will do immediately after answering this question.

The gentleman from Mississippi asked whether or not our committee would cooperate in getting irrigation benefits for the Eastern and Southern States if for some reason or other difficulty is encountered with the Poage bill.

My answer to him is that the bill now before us when it came out of our committee applied to the 48 States but provided for the administration of the entire program in the whole country by the Department of the Interior. On the floor of the House, however, the Department of Agriculture was put in charge of projects outside of the 17 Western States which, of course, is the genesis of the difficulty we have had and as a result of which separate legislation has been introduced to authorize these small projects by the Department of Agriculture in other parts of the country.

So the answer to the gentleman's question is, Yes; and the precedent of the committee's action in including the 48 States is the best evidence I can cite to him of our intention and the attitude of our committee with reference to aiding the other States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in May of 1955 when the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported the bill H. R. 5881 to the House, the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior extended to the 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. When that bill was called up for debate on the floor of the House on May 26, 1955, there was an amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Alabama to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to the 17 Western Reclamation States and in the 31 Midwestern, Eastern, Southern States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska the Secretary of Agriculture would administer the provisions of the bill. That is the way the bill passed the House.

It went over to the Senate, and the Senate also passed a bill covering the 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

We went to conference in June of 1955. The conferees appointed on the part of the House were our good chairman, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and myself. The managers on the part of the Senate were Senators ANDERSON, BIBLE, WATKINS, BARRETT, and LONG of Louisiana.

It is interesting, and the Members of the House should know, that 7 of the 10 conferees came from the 17 Western States. All of the conferees who signed that report with the exception of the Honorable LEO O'BRIEN came from the 17 Western States. Senator LONG and myself did not sign this conference report. I could not in good conscience sign it. I am therefore going to ask the Members of the House to recommit this to the conferees because the House and the Senate both have spoken and have explicitly stated they expected this bill to apply to the 48 States, and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

What the conferees did, in my opinion, was to absolutely disregard the will of the House and to absolutely disregard the will of the Senate and write their own legislation. This bill now gives the same \$100 million not to the 48 States and the two Territories. This gives the \$100 million to the 17 Western States.

Mr. Speaker, it is true, as has been pointed out, that we have passed the Poage bill, and I voted for that bill and I will support it and I hope that it will be come law; but the very reasons that has been given that we should accept this conference report indicates to me that the major premise of the proponents' argument is false, because if we should pass the Poage bill it will take care of not just the other 31 States but the entire 48 States. Why therefore should we pass this bill just to take care of the 17 Western States? If the Poage bill is as good as the chairman of our committee has said it is and as Mr. POAGE says it is, and as I hope that it is, we do not need this legislation, for all the States will be provided for. Why should we give to the 17 Western States the \$100 million provided for in this conference report when the House of Representatives and the United States Senate said it should extend to all 48 States? To me, the proponents and conferees who signed this report fail to answer that important question.

May I say to the Members who come from the Midwest, Eastern, and Southern States that probably each and every one of you have had the same experience I have had. Municipalities and interested groups in your home communities have written to you to ask whether or not there is anything in the law that would enable them to get a little Federal help so that they might improve their water system or that they might enlarge their water system, or control their waste water, or irrigate their lands. They do not ask for a Federal grant but they would like just a little Federal help. They have been hearing about the fact that the 17 Western States have been able to use the Bureau of Reclamation and through it secure Federal funds to get help for the towns in those 17 Western States for the very type of project that yours and my communities are seeking. But we in the Midwest, East, and the South have had absolutely no help from the Federal Government for these identical projects. One of the things I had hoped would come out of the conference was that the Midwest, the East, and the South would be able to get

for our communities just the same benefits enjoyed by the 17 Western States for so many years at the expense of the Midwest, the East, and the South. During the many sessions of the conference Senator LONG and I did not try to cut down the rights enjoyed by the 17 Western States. We only ask that our people be entitled to the same benefits. But, no, no; we did not get that. We were told that this bill should be changed to take care of the 17 Western States and if any help were to be given to the Midwest, the East, and the South it would come from the Poage bill. Under the guise of the Poage bill being passed some day we were told we could have no help in this conference report; that we in the 31 Midwest, Eastern, and Southern States could not have the same benefits for our communities to help them with their municipal water supply, to help them with their industrial water supply, to help them with their saline water control problems that we have in all of the Eastern States and on the Gulf of Mexico. No; we are cut out; we will have to rely on the Poage bill.

Well, let us see what has happened to the Poage bill. The Poage bill, as it passed the House of Representatives, was referred to the Senate and was sent to the Senate Agriculture Committee. Since it came before the House Agriculture Committee, it went, I think, to the proper committee, but the great chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee asked that his committee be discharged from the consideration of that bill and had it referred to another committee. I have recently been informed that it has since been reported to a third committee and not reported out as of this time.

Now, when the House of Representatives passes a bill covering 48 States, which enables the people in every town and hamlet in the Midwest, the East, and the South to get some assistance from the Federal Government for their water-control problems—and I think it is conceded by all Members of the House and the Senate and the members of the executive department that water is one of the great problems of our country—why should we give this special consideration now to the 17 Western States? If the bill should be referred back to the conferees and told that the House passed a bill covering the 48 States and they wanted these benefits extended under this bill to the 48 States, then to me it seems it comes with poor grace from several of the bureaus downtown to report adversely on this bill.

Now, I can understand why the Department of the Interior reported adversely on the bill. To me it is very simple. Their jurisdiction was not extended. They were told that the House expected them to continue to control the water in the 17 Western States and to not come into the 31 Midwest, Eastern, and Southern States. In the 31 Midwest, Eastern, and Southern States we already have the Department of Agriculture functioning, and the Department of Agriculture should extend its groundwork and all they would have had to do was to enlarge their present program a very little bit,

and they would have been able to handle it. The reason the Department of Agriculture reported adversely on this bill is this: This bill would have given them a job to do that would have required them to do a little work. The bureaus downtown do not like to work unless they are performing duties that they have asked Congress to pass.

One of the things before the House right now on this conference report, I think, is that they must determine whether or not they should pass the legislation and determine what should be done with regard to the laws of this country or whether we should leave it up to 1 or 2 of the bureaus downtown. I think this issue on this conference report points up very clearly the fact that the Members of the House must decide whether or not they are actually the legislative body of the United States or whether the legislative body lies within certain bureaus downtown.

As one who is interested in extending the provisions of this bill to all 48 States, Hawaii, and Alaska for equal treatment to all, I urge you to vote to recommit this conference report to the conferees.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I understand there is \$100 million involved in this bill. Is that right?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. GAVIN. That would be then prorated among the 17 States that would participate in the program; is that right?

Mr. SAYLOR. It would be allocated among the 17 Western States by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. GAVIN. Now, if the House bill had been agreed to and no deletion made by the conferees, then the \$100 million would have given 48 States an opportunity to participate in this overall program; is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. There was absolutely no effort on the part of the conferees to cut down the \$100 million. The only thing they cut was the number of States from 48 to 17. But they kept the \$100 million for the 17 Western States.

Mr. GAVIN. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the only answer to it is this. The other 31 States that would like to participate in the program will be paying the taxes which will be used to make up the fund of \$100 million to give the benefits to those 17 States.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is right.

Mr. GAVIN. I think it is a great program. All I ask is that fair and equitable consideration be given to all sections of the country and no special benefits to one section against any other section of the country. If they had let the bill alone as it passed the House and the Senate I would be for it. I would support the Poage bill. I think we are entitled to just as much consideration as any other section of the country.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. That is the reason I oppose this conference report. I should like this extended to all the 48 States.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman does not want to leave the impression with the Members of the House that there is going to be a prorated division of the \$100 million authorized by this bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. No; I should like to make that very clear, that the gentleman's group kept the \$100 million. The only thing that was prorated was the States. The \$100 million will be allocated to the States by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ASPINALL. But the money is not to be prorated State by State, anything like that. This is a trial or a research authorization. The gentleman also will admit that the Poage bill, which is an amendment to the Small Watersheds Act and which is supposed to take care of the interests of the 31 other States, has an unended authorization; that is, there is no limit to it and moneys may be expended as the Congress of the United States sees fit.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. But the important thing is that the Poage bill includes the 17 Western States; it does not exclude the 17 Western States, and they will have the benefits of this bill and the Poage bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the contents of the conference report have been accurately stated by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]. Part of the report has been discussed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. SAYLOR], who is opposed to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are here considering a conference report on a bill for small projects, a bill that we passed in the 83d Congress and then lost in the other body in the closing days of that Congress. It has the same principle exactly, which I shall explain a little later. The bill before us now passed this Congress in June of last year. It did have 2 sections, 1 the watershed section touching the 31 Eastern and Southern States and the other dealing with the 17 Western States.

In the conference, of the managers on the part of the House and Senate, 8 of the 10 conferees saw fit to delete the watershed section, dealing with the 31 States, with the understanding that they would be included in a watershed bill known as the Poage-Hope bill, which passed this House. There is some concern about why that was done. I hold in my hand letters from the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, these agencies wanted a separation of the bill because of duplication and troubles of administration—your conference committee followed the suggestion of the agencies concerned.

This is a bill to permit managers of local projects to handle their own planning, do their own work without a great deal of interference by the Federal Government. It is necessary for the local group to put up a thousand dollars to have their plans reviewed by the Federal Government. They may deposit up to 25 percent of the money and they may borrow up to \$5 million if they meet all qualifications. It keeps details of planning and operation at the local level. It cuts out controls from Washington.

I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is worried about the \$100 million, that is the ceiling on the amount of money in the bill. Every penny of that money is to be paid back to the Federal Treasury. That is not true in the watersheds bill, which I voted for and which I think is a good bill. The only money repaid there would be the money for the municipal water supply. As to the flood-control moneys, the great State of Pennsylvania has received a quarter of a billion dollars in flood-control money, and not one penny of that has been or will be paid back to the Treasury.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Not at this point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The local groups do the planning. They must repay borrowed moneys.

The local groups do their own planning. The bill has a provision that lets Congress review the project plans. That is a good point.

The original bill as passed by the House would have been difficult to administer. This is not a dispute between the 17 Western States and the East or South. Not at all. The watershed bill will benefit all States. I think the watershed bill is an excellent approach to the subject, and I voted for that bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] referred to the fact that the bill that passed the House had 48 States in it and the bill as it passed the Senate had 48 States in it, with, of course, a separate title for the portion under the Department of Agriculture. But it is true, is it not, that since that happened the House passed the Poage bill, which takes care of those portions under the Department of Agriculture? That bill is presently pending in established committees of the Senate. That is the reason we had to take that provision out and that the Senate conferees would not agree to tacking the Poage bill on.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman is correct. We should remember that this conference report makes it possible for local groups to borrow the money from the Federal Treasury. They must put up some of their own money. They have certain obligations they must fulfill. After they do that they can borrow the money and it must be paid back over a period of years.

I think the conference report is a good report. We have worked hard on it, and I recommend that it be adopted.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, after listening to my very good and able friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], of his very able presentation, I want to say I heartily concur in what he has said. I agree with him that this proposed legislation should be recommitted for further consideration. I feel that an injustice is being done in making it a sectional bill. Had the 48 States been considered rather than 17 States in the northwestern section of the country I would say it would be all right. However, it is quite evident that the 17 States and the Northwest got together and worked out legislation that will delete the 31 States in the East and the South and set up a \$100 million program for their particular section of the Nation. If this bill is passed there will no doubt be a conference with Department of Interior as to the allocation of the \$100 million authorized among the 17 States. Very nice program, I would say, for the Northwest; not so good for the East or South. All we do is pay the bill but not share the benefits.

There is something unique about the Congress. We do not seem to be organized in the northeastern part of the United States, and by that I mean the New England States and Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island and Delaware. Some day, I hope in the not too distant future, we are going to get organized in the Northeast section as you are in the Northwest and then when these various programs come up we will say, "Certainly, we will go along with various legislative proposals provided you give fair and equitable treatment to all sections of the Nation and do not give preferred consideration to one section against another." So long as you look after your area you are not concerned about the rest of the States. After legislation was enacted to include the other 31 States in the bill the conferees got together. As was pointed out by my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, 8 of the 10 conferees came from the Northwest. So the only two in the minority, Senator LONG, of Louisiana, and Representative SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, objected and were overruled. Certainly, they objected. So, we feel that it is rather an injustice that 17 States would bring in legislation to the exclusion of the other 31 States. Had I been one of the conferees handling the conference report, I would have let the legislation alone just as it was agreed upon by the House and Senate and would have permitted the 48 States to participate in this program without giving preferred consideration to one section of the country over any other section.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman from Colorado to say that the \$100 million which would go to the 17

States was for experimental and research purposes?

Mr. GAVIN. If it is, it is quite a costly experimental and research program. I would not mind the northeastern section of the country having some kind of experimental program. My good friend here, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] can tell you about the coal industry in our State. I wish we could secure a \$100 million program to carry on a research program to develop some technique and methods by which we could produce and sell more Pennsylvania coal. There are hundreds of miners who have been unemployed in the great State of Pennsylvania for the past several years in our region. A research program for coal would be most helpful. But should we offer legislation for such a program for coal in Pennsylvania, I wonder how much consideration would be given to it? Again, I say it is about time the States in the Northeast get organized. I hope we can get these Northeast States together and get organized and then maybe we can get some equitable and fair consideration when these legislative proposals are presented. I trust when this conference reported is voted upon it will be recommended and the conferees will come up with legislation that will give fair treatment to all the States of the Nation.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, we have this afternoon witnessed a considerable difference of honest opinion. I think it is clear that everybody here is agreed that we ought to have a water program. Everybody, regardless of where he lives recognizes the importance of providing water storage both for municipal purposes and for irrigation purposes. The people of the West realized the need of water storage first because it was a more pressing problem for them. But, now such storage is a pressing problem for all parts of the United States.

This conference report will not solve all our problems all over the United States, but it does make a start in the direction that all of us think is sound and desirable. When combined with the bill that the Committee on Agriculture brought before this House recently and which we passed, and which is now pending in regular order in the other body, it will, as I see it, give us a pretty good water storage program all over the United States.

Now there are those who honestly say, "Let us beat down this conference report this afternoon and possibly that will force the advocates of the Engle bill into passing the Poage bill before we agree to this report." It seems to me that it is just a mistaken idea that you can or should force or blackmail others into seeing things your way. I think we all pretty well see the thing alike. We are all pretty well agreed that we need a water-storage program in every State in the Union. The bill, which the House recently passed, makes a water-storage program available to every State in the Union. This conference report on the one hand gives a program which I think is needed for these Western States, which

are even more dependent on irrigation than your section and mine, perhaps. I live east of the 98th meridian. There are those who are trying to divide this House on a sectional basis. I do not live in that region where the Bureau of Reclamation now operates, although I do live in the great State of Texas. I come from east of that 98th meridian. Nevertheless, I want the reclamation area to have the program which they need. I also want the other States to have not only a water-storage program, but I also want the people of every State to have a sound flood-prevention program. The Poage bill provides both. Of course, I think the Poage bill should pass. Everyone seems agreed on that. The only question is whether we are more likely to secure passage by cooperation or by a kind of blackmail. I urge you to use cooperation.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall].

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I think that the greatest difficulty here is the question of the jurisdiction of those who must supervise any of these programs. No one can charge me with being sectional in my approach to any of the beneficial conservation programs. I have always favored and supported programs that would help the Nation generally, regardless of where the projects—reclamation, flood control, or multipurpose—are located.

The Reclamation Act, the law of 1902, gave to the Department of the Interior the authority to supervise the reclamation program and such authority does not extend east of the 17 Western States. Accordingly, when we included in the original bill the 31 Western States we got into a difficulty of administration. There is no way at the present time by which the administration, that is, the Department of the Interior, can supervise under the terms of the general reclamation law any of the benefits which the 17 Western States have.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. When I have finished my statement I will yield.

The conference committee is not composed of 8 western Members of Congress but is composed of 7 Members from the West—the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien] is the third member of the majority of the House conferees. The members of the conference were chosen in accordance with the rules of seniority in this House. We were agreeable to going along with a separate bill—the Poage bill—for administration by the Department of Agriculture, because we wanted all of the States to have the benefits which flow from irrigation programs and projects.

I now yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is it not a fact that part of this \$100 million that is mentioned is derived from reclamation funds? Reclamation funds are separate from the revenues that come

from the land holdings in these 17 Western States?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. The reason for the \$100 million authorization limit in this legislation is for the purpose of determining whether or not a program like this, under the jurisdiction of a Federal department, can be operated successfully and effectively. There was no question of dividing up the monetary benefits, that might be considered, between different areas of the Nation.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman realizes that the 31 States were to be operated under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture, so there would not be any difficulty in that respect, even if they were all in the same bill. The 17 States under the Bureau of Reclamation and 31 States under Department of Agriculture. What assurance have we that the other body is going to take any action on this bill in this session of the Congress? None whatsoever. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] said the position we have taken today may be an effort to try to compel the Senate to take action on the Poage bill. I might say to the gentleman from Texas it will be a day well spent, as far as I am concerned, if we could recommit this bill and the other body did take action and passed the Poage bill. I would feel reconciled to this situation that fair and equitable consideration will be given to all States and sections of the country. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage], said the present bill before us was a step in the right direction. To me it is in the wrong direction. It is going in the direction of the Northwest and I am in the direction of the Northeast. If it was directed to the Northeast it would be all right with me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall] has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. Bass].

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my support to this conference report. It does not go as far as it should in taking in all the States in the East. However, I was happy to serve on the subcommittee which wrote the watershed protection amendment, known as the Poage bill, which includes agricultural irrigation service and also municipal water supplies to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture. I hope, and I feel sure the Senate will take up that bill in the near future and pass the necessary legislation to carry out the provisions that are being demanded by people who are opposing this conference report.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. What we are talking about is separate but equal treatment, because we have to handle matters in separate bills, inasmuch as one is in Agriculture and one is in Interior.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. Separate and equal treatment, and we propose that the Poage bill will do just that.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SAYLOR moves to recommit the conference report to the conferees.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR) there were—ayes 48, noes 66.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would remind the gentleman that there was an understanding that no votes would be had today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the conference report be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of no quorum.

AMENDING COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 503 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4090) to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to require the installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final

passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, when I have concluded my statement, I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 4090 is to amend section 353 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that cargo vessels of the United States must carry more than one radio operator unless the ship is fitted with an automatic radiotelegraph call selector, in addition to the auto-alarm required by present law.

The bill would also amend section 353 to provide that a continuous watch by means of qualified radio operators must be kept unless the ship is fitted with both the automatic radiotelegraph call selector and the auto-alarm.

It is pointed out in the report accompanying H. R. 4090 that such installation would facilitate and improve communications and thus promote safety standards at sea for the protection of life and property.

The effective date of the mandatory installation requirement is 18 months, or shorter if the Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission has found that the call selector is available and may be installed at a reasonable cost to shipowners, and that the patents necessary for the manufacture of the device are and will continue to be freely available for license at a reasonable royalty.

Mr. Speaker, this is a step in the right direction as far as safety of the sea is concerned. I recall just about a year ago—to be exact on June 27, 1955—when in Boston Harbor an excursion ship that travels around the harbor and oftentimes to Nantucket and to Providence, with 272 of a school group aboard ran aground in a dense fog in Boston Harbor. It was amazing to the public at large and to the people at large that there was no auto alarm, there was no radio alarm, there was no ship-to-shore communication available on this excursion steamer. If the 272 aboard had ever realized there was no means of communicating to another ship or back to shore, there surely would have been a panic aboard that boat. There was a headline in the paper of that day that caused great concern. At the present time we have a little over a thousand ships in our cargo fleet that must have auto alarms. Auto alarms are used only in cases of dire distress when they send out an SOS. The radio telegraph alarm which is forced to be put into these new ships or they would have to carry an added radio man does this:

No. 1. The automatic radio telegraph call selector with capability of receiving and responding to the following: A, the international distress signal, S O S, B, the international safety signal, T T T, the international urgent signal, X X X, the ship's call sign and any other predetermined code which is desired for use in national emergency.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated previously, this definitely is a step in the right di-

rection. This is an opportunity for the Congress to enact legislation for further safety of life at sea.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 503 and at this time yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the membership of this House will appreciate that it is not exactly a happy situation to oppose a bill authored by the majority leader.

At least, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is only doing what he believes to be right in opposing legislation he believes to be wrong.

H. R. 4090 is not a major piece of legislation. It is not included in any political program. It should be judged free of party and personalities. So, first, I urge my colleagues to act on the merit of the bill and not on the merit of its author and his worthy motives.

In my opinion, just the opposite occurred when the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported the bill out. In fact, it reminded me of the old game of follow the leader. It could not have been decided, it seemed to me, on the basis of the testimony and hearings, and I feel if you read the 130 pages of the hearings you will recognize this as a gadget bill wrapped up and labeled "Safety at Sea."

A substantial minority of the Commerce Committee, according to the minority views, voted against reporting H. R. 4090 favorably.

The witnesses favoring H. R. 4090 were the owner of the patents, his son-in-law, a representative of one group of radio operators, and of course the distinguished author of this bill. Outside the latter, the proponents had some reason to hope for the passage of the bill.

For that matter, admittedly the various shipowners' associations had similar incentives to oppose the measure.

But the departments of Government which were negative or downright opposed certainly are objective critics and in the case of the Federal Communications Commission, particularly Commissioner Webster, are experts in this field and the very sources to which we laymen should look in order to avoid pitfalls and mistakes.

When I was a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during the 83d Congress hearings were held on a bill similar to H. R. 4090. I signed minority views. Time, service on the Merchant Marine Committee, and further testimony have only served to increase my knowledge of the facts and conviction that this is bad legislation.

Frankly, it seemed to me the argument in the Rules Committee the other day was not a matter of explanation and logic but more of emotion.

For example, there was an attack on the steamship owners and the statement was made that this industry had always

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

June 14, 1956
June 13, 1956
84th-2nd, No. 98

CONTENTS

Accounting.....25	Foreign trade.....22	Reclamation.....1,20,40
Appropriations8,15,27,39,41,46	Forestry.....9,30,35,39	Research.....23
Budgeting.....25	Housing.....3,33	School milk.....2
Buildings.....34	Irrigation.....21	Small business.....44
Dairy industry.....2	Lands.....36,43	Surplus commodities.....17
Depressed areas.....45	Legislative program.....15	Transportation.....14
Education.....6	Loans, farm.....3	Treaties.....26
Electrification.....20	Marketing.....18	Vegetables.....23
Experiment stations.....36	Natural resources.....13	Veterans' benefits...12,24
Farm program.....4,18	Personnel.....31,42	Virgin Islands.....37
Food and drugs.....19,38	Poultry inspection.....11	Water.....5
Food bank.....10	Prices.....44	Wheat.....7
Foreign aid.....28,29	Public debt.....32	Wildlife refuges.....13
	Public power.....16	

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to conference report on small reclamation projects bill. Rep. Long criticized administration's farm policies. House authorized committee to report housing bill by Saturday midnight. House subcommittee ordered reported bill extending special school milk program to other institutions. Senate received from President International Wheat Agreement. Senate committee reported bill to purchase lands in Cache National Forest. Senate passed public works appropriation bill. Sen Scott urged creation of world food bank. Sens. Mundt, Eastland, McCarthy introduced and Sens. Mundt and McCarthy discussed bills re summary suspension of Federal employees.

HOUSE

1. **RECLAMATION.** Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 5881, to provide Federal assistance, in the 17 Western States, to local irrigation districts, water districts, and other public agencies in the construction of small projects; having previously rejected a motion to recommit the conference report by a vote of 179 to 209. p. 9194
2. **MILK.** The Dairy Products Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee ordered reported to the full committee H. R. 11375, to extend the special school milk program to certain institutions for the care and training of children. p. D620
3. **HOUSING; FARM LOANS.** The Banking and Currency Committee, on June 12, ordered reported H. R. 11510, to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and conservation and development of urban communities, and certain farm housing programs; and on June 13, Rep. Spence requested and received permission to file, by Saturday midnight, a report on H. R. 11742, a clean bill on the same subject. p. 9194
4. **FARM PROGRAM.** Rep. Long criticized this Administration's farm policies as being detrimental to the best interests of the American farmer. p. 9244

5. WATER POLLUTION. Passed with amendment H. R. 9540, to provide for cooperative research and action by the Public Health Service and State and local organizations to combat the problem of water pollution, and to authorize certain expenditures for the implementation of the programs (p. 9198). Subsequent to this action, the House considered S. 890, a similar bill, and substituted the provisions of H. R. 9540, as passed, for the language of the State bill; conferees were then appointed; and H. R. 9540 was laid on the table. p. 9241
6. EDUCATION. The Education and Labor Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11695, to extend until June 30, 1958, the programs of financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in certain areas affected by Federal activities (H. Rept. 2367). p. 9256

SENATE

7. WHEAT. Received from the President the International Wheat Agreement formulated at the United Nations Wheat Conference; to Foreign Relations Committee. p. 9109
8. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendment H. R. 11319, the public works appropriation bill for 1957. Conferees were appointed. pp. 9141, 9148
The Appropriations Subcommittee ordered reported with amendments to the full committee H. R. 11473, the legislative branch appropriation bill for 1957. p. D618
9. FORESTRY. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 3132, to provide for the purchase of lands within the Cache National Forest, Utah (S. Rept. 2207). p. 9110
10. FOOD BANK. Sen. Scott urged the creation of a world food bank as a means of improving our relations with other countries. p. 9133
11. POULTRY INSPECTION. Received from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee its report, "Compulsory Inspection of Poultry" (S. Doc. 129). p. 9118
12. VETERANS' BENEFITS. Sen. Lehman announced that hearings will be held June 20 and 21 on pending bills to extend the veterans' loan-guaranty program. p. 9119
13. NATURAL RESOURCES. Sen. Neuberger stated that oil and gas drilling in national wildlife refuges is inconsistent with the original purpose of these game sanctuaries, and inserted several statements on the matter. p. 9129
Sen. Watkins expressed gratification on the renewed interest in the conservation of our natural resources, and inserted his statement and that of Mrs. Gifford Pinchot on the subject. p. 9167
14. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Thye urged early passage of legislation to help alleviate the shortage of railroad boxcars, and inserted his letter to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee urging early action of such pending bills. p. 9140
15. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnson announced that the conference report on the Commerce Dept. appropriation bill will be considered today. p. 9148
16. PUBLIC POWER. Sen. Morse discussed the possible effects that would result from the construction of the Hells Canyon dam. p. 9171

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Ralph Silverstein, spiritual leader of Temple Sinai (the Arlington Temple), Brooklyn, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Lord of the universe, Father of all mankind, bless, we pray Thee, the distinguished Members of this great deliberative body—the House of Representatives.

Bless our ailing President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and grant that he may enjoy a speedy and complete recovery.

In this hour of continuing world crisis, O Lord, when the dark clouds of hydrogen war continue to hover so menacingly overhead and when the very fate of civilization itself seems to tremble in the balance, we are deeply stirred and heartened by the knowledge that in our beloved land and elsewhere throughout the world men of all faiths are turning to Thee in ever greater numbers. For in the face of global events and movements so overwhelming in their very magnitude and complexity, we are but as helpless children groping for Thy light and Thy salvation. But Thy divine spirit, O God, moves within us in ways which passeth understanding. There are great and gifted men in this our Government, in this our House of Representatives. Inspire them, O Heavenly Father—enlarge their vision. Fill them with a holy zeal and a crusading spirit to bring the blessings of true brotherhood to our own beloved America so that none may be demeaned as second-class citizens, whatever be their faith or their race, for all are truly Thy children and Thou are our Father.

Make them unfailingly mindful that in many ways Washington is the capital of the world, that whatever is said and done here literally affects the very fate of mankind. Grant us the strength, the wisdom, and the determination to banish forever the dread scourge of war from the face of the earth and ordain, we beseech Thee, that our sorely troubled world may at long last enjoy Thy sweet blessings of universal peace and brotherhood under Thine all-embracing fatherhood, O God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

VOTE TO RECOMMIT H. R. 5881

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD).

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, when you vote today on the most-favored 17 States in the Northwest legislation, conference report on H. R. 5881, small-projects leg-

islation, vote to recommit this bill. Because you are voting a \$100 million authorization to these 17 most-favored States to the exclusion of 31 other States which were included in the legislation; but after the conferees got through with H. R. 5881, these 31 States were excluded. The only participation the States in the East and the South will enjoy in this legislation—if it can be called enjoyment—is that your constituents will be called upon to pay the taxes to pay the \$100 million incorporated in the bill in the report for the benefit of the 17 most-favored States. Vote to recommit the conference report.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

(Mr. WAINWRIGHT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Folsom, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have just introduced legislation designed to carry out the first recommendation of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School which he recently appointed. It would authorize the appropriation of \$800,000 for grants to the States to encourage the States to provide for a State committee on education beyond the high school to conduct studies and conferences and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken by public and private agencies to meet our pressing problems related to higher education.

Our Nation cannot afford to lapse into a situation of desperation with respect to higher education. I commend the President of the United States for his insistence that there be advanced planning so that we can avert a crisis in higher education. My bill would carry out the President's, the administration's policy. The best explanation is set forth in a letter from Mr. Folsom to Speaker RAYBURN which is here set forth:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, June 11, 1956.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am enclosing for your consideration a draft bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school.

The draft bill would authorize the appropriation of \$800,000, to be available until June 30, 1958, for grants to the States on the basis of their respective populations, in order to encourage and assist each State to provide for a State committee on education beyond the high school, which committee, through studies and conferences, would consider educational problems beyond the high

school and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken by public and private agencies at local, State, regional, and Federal levels. States would be required, through their Governors, to undertake to use grants solely for the purposes of the act and to have their State committees submit reports to the Commissioner of Education for use of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.

You will recall that the President in his special message to the Congress on January 12, 1956, expressed his concern about the growing problems in the field of education beyond the high school and indicated that he would appoint a committee to develop proposals in this field, as follows:

"Shortages now exist in medicine, teaching, nursing, science, engineering, and in other fields of knowledge which require education beyond the level of the secondary school. Changing times and conditions create new opportunities and challenges. There are now possibilities for older persons, properly trained, to lead more productive and rewarding lives. The tide of increasing school enrollment will soon reach higher educational institutions. Within 10 years we may expect 3 students in our colleges and universities for every 2 who are there now.

"Higher education is and must remain the responsibility of the States, localities, and private groups and institutions. But to lay before us all the problems of education beyond high school, and to encourage active and systematic attack on them, I shall appoint a distinguished group of educators and citizens to develop this year, through studies and conferences, proposals in this educational field. Through the leadership and counsel of this group, beneficial results can be expected to flow to education and to the Nation, in the years ahead."

Composition of the committee was announced April 19 and on April 27 it met, organized, and agreed on basic objectives as follows: First, to collect, assemble, and disseminate information for the purpose of increasing public awareness of the vast challenge which lies ahead in the field of education beyond the high school; second, to encourage the planning and action which must now be undertaken by institutions and groups of institutions, locally and nationally, publicly and privately, to meet the impending demands upon our educational system; the third, to advise the President as to the proper role of the Federal Government in this field and to recommend appropriate Federal policies and relationships.

In order to provide immediate stimulus to the initiation of widespread planning, studies, and action which should be undertaken now by institutions, States, and localities, the committee recommended the provision of one-time grants to the States to encourage and assist each State to establish a State committee on education beyond the high school. These State counterparts to the national committee are essential not only for coordination of study and planning activities in the States but to provide a nationwide mechanism for liaison with the national committee. The instant draft bill is designed to accomplish these objectives.

This Department shares with the Committee on Education Beyond the High School and with the educational leadership of the Nation, the great concern we all have about

the necessity of bringing concerted action to bear on the mounting problems which we foresee ahead in this field of education and in meeting our future manpower needs. We are, therefore, in accord with the recommendation of the committee.

I shall appreciate it if you would refer the draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM,
Secretary.

PROSPERITY OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

(Mr. HILL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks a clipping from the Longmont Times-Call, Longmont, Colo., which clearly indicates the prosperity of the State of Colorado. Income-tax collections are a definite barometer of the economic conditions of business interests. It is worth reading and answers some of the arguments of those who would have you believe we are on the verge of a depression.

STATE INCOME TAX COLLECTIONS \$2½ MILLION AHEAD

DENVER.—Colorado State income tax collections are \$2,500,000 ahead of the first 5 months of last year, Revenue Director Earl Blevins reported Friday.

He said receipts for the first 5 months of 1956 totaled \$20,987,591, compared with \$18,403,749 for the same 1955 period.

Income-tax receipts for all of 1955 amounted to \$26,203,286.

Blevins said the department has processed 470,661 returns so far this year, as compared with 423,684 for the first 5 months of last year. Approximately 100,000 returns remain to be processed, he added.

The total number of returns last year was 500,847.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday to file their report on the bill H. R. 11742.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business before the House is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] to recommit the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects, and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

Without objection the Clerk will again report the motion to recommit.

The was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SAYLOR moves to recommit the conference report to the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR) there were—ayes 10, noes 92.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 209, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—179

Abbitt	Dorn, N. Y.	Minshall
Alexander	Durham	Morano
Andresen,	Felghan	Moulder
August H.	Fenton	Mumma
Arends	Fino	Nicholson
Ashley	Flood	O'Neill
Ashmore	Flynt	Osmers
Auchincloss	Ford	Ostertag
Barrett	Forrester	Patterson
Bass, N. H.	Fountain	Perkins
Bates	Frelinghuysen	Philbin
Baumhart	Fulton	Pilcher
Beamer	Gary	Pillion
Becker	Gavin	Poff
Bennett, Mich.	Gray	Polk
Bentley	Green, Pa.	Preston
Betts	Gregory	Quigley
Boggs	Gross	Radwan
Bolton,	G'Winn	Ray
Frances P.	Haley	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton,	Hand	Reed, N. Y.
Oliver P.	Harden	Riehlman
Bonner	Hardy	Robeson, Va.
Bosch	Harrison, Va.	Robson, Ky.
Bow	Henderson	Rogers, Mass.
Bowler	Heseltun	Sadlak
Bray	Hess	St. George
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	Saylor
Brownson	Holland	Schenck
Broyhill	Hull	Scherer
Bush	Hyde	Schwengel
Byrne, Pa.	James	Seely-Brown
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenkins	Sheehan
Canfield	Jennings	Short
Cannon	Jensen	Shuford
Carlyle	Johansen	Siler
Carrigg	Jonas	Simpson, Ill.
Cederberg	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Miss.
Chelf	Jones, N. C.	Smith, Va.
Chiperfield	Judd	Smith, Wis.
Chudoff	Kean	Taber
Church	Kearney	Talle
Clark	Kearns	Taylor
Clevenger	Keating	Thompson,
Cole	Kilburn	Mich.
Colmer	King, Pa.	Tuck
Corbett	Knox	Van Zandt
Coudert	Laird	Vorys
Cramer	Lantrum	Vursell
Cretella	Lanham	Walter
Cunningham	Latham	Watts
Curtis, Mass.	LeCompte	Wharton
Dague	Long	Whitten
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Widnall
Davis, Wis.	McGregor	Wigglesworth
Derounlan	McVey	Williams, Miss.
Devereux	Macdonald	Williams, N. Y.
Dodd	Martin	Willis
Dondero	Meador	Winstead
Donohue	Morrow	Wolcott
Donovan	Miller, Md.	Wolverton

NAYS—209

Abernethy	Belcher	Burnside
Adair	Bennett, Fla.	Byrd
Addonizio	Berry	Celler
Albert	Blatnik	Chase
Alger	Blitch	Chatham
Allen, Calif.	Boland	Chenoweth
Andrews	Bolling	Coon
Anfuso	Boykin	Cooper
Aspinall	Boyle	Crumpacker
Avery	Brooks, La.	Curtis, Mo.
Ayres	Brooks, Tex.	Davis, Tenn.
Bailey	Brown, Ga.	Dawson, Ill.
Baker	Buckley	Dawson, Utah
Baldwin	Budge	Deane
Barden	Burdick	Delaney
Bass, Tenn.	Burleson	Dempsey

Denton	Kee	Rees, Kans.
Dies	Kelly, N. Y.	Reuss
Dingell	Keogh	Rhodes, Pa.
Dixon	Kilday	Riley
Dollinger	Kilgore	Roberts
Dorn, S. C.	King, Calif.	Rodino
Doyle	Kirwan	Rogers, Colo.
Edmondson	Klein	Rogers, Fla.
Elliott	Kluczynski	Rogers, Tex.
Ellsworth	Knutson	Rooney
Engle	Krueger	Roosevelt
Evins	Lankford	Rutherford
Fallon	Lesinski	Scrivner
Fascell	Lipscomb	Scudder
Fernandez	Lovre	Selden
Fisher	McCarthy	Shelley
Fjare	McCormack	Sheppard
Fogarty	McDonough	Sieminski
Forand	McDowell	Sikes
Frazier	McIntire	Smith, Kans.
Friedel	Mack, Ill.	Spence
Garmatz	Mack, Wash.	Springer
Gathings	Madden	Staggers
Gentry	Magnuson	Steed
Gordon	Mahon	Sullivan
Grant	Maillard	Teague, Calif.
Green, Oreg.	Marshall	Teague, Tex.
Griffiths	Mathews	Thomas
Gubser	Metcalf	Thompson, N. J.
Hagen	Miller, Nebr.	Thompson, Tex.
Harris	Mills	Thomson, Wyo.
Harrison, Nebr.	Mollohan	Tollefson
Harvey	Morgan	Trimble
Hays, Ark.	Moss	Tumulty
Hayworth	Multer	Udall
Healey	Murray, Ill.	Utt
Hébert	Murray, Tenn.	Vanik
Herlong	Natcher	Van Pelt
Hiestand	Norblad	Velde
Hill	Norrell	Vinson
Hillings	O'Brien, Ill.	Walnwright
Hinshaw	O'Brien, N. Y.	Weaver
Holmes	O'Hara, Ill.	Wier
Holt	O'Konski	Williams, N. J.
Holtzman	Passman	Wilson, Calif.
Hope	Pelly	Wilson, Ind.
Hosmer	Pfost	Withrow
Huddleston	Phillips	Wright
Ikard	Poage	Yates
Jarman	Powell	Young
Johnson, Calif.	Price	Younger
Johnson, Wis.	Priest	Zablocki
Jones, Ala.	Rabaut	Zelenko
Karsten	Rains	

NOT VOTING—44

Allen, Ill.	Halleck	Morrison
Andersen,	Hays, Ohio	Nelson
H. Carl	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.
Bell	Hoffman, Mich.	Patman
Carnahan	Holifield	Prouty
Christopher	Horan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cooley	Jackson	Richards
Davidson	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Diggs	Lane	Scott
Dolliver	McConnell	Simpson, Pa.
Dowdy	McMillan	Sisk
Eberhart	Machrowicz	Thompson, La.
Gamble	Mason	Thornberry
George	Miller, Calif.	Westland
Hale	Miller, N. Y.	Wickersham

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Westland against.
Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Horan against.
Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Carnahan against.
Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Hale for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Prouty for, with Mr. Cooley against.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Sisk against.
Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Davidson against.
Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Wier with Mr. George.

Mr. Richards with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. RABAUT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. QUIGLEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BELCHER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MERROW changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BEAMER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CHENOWETH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KIRWAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PERKINS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this legislation plugs the gap in our present water conservation program. Prior to 1902, the pioneer residents of the arid western States had constructed on their own just about all of the reclamation projects that could be financed without assistance in the form of loans from the Government. The passage of the Reclamation Act of 1902 recognized that fact. Since that time, the Federal Government through the Bureau of Reclamation has made additional funds available on a repayable basis. This has enabled the rapidly growing West to meet its current water requirements.

There is an area, however, where an additional program is needed. Local financing takes care of the projects under \$1 million. The Bureau of Reclamation program in the past has furnished the engineering know-how for the larger multipurpose projects. But in each of the western reclamation States there are feasible projects in the \$1 million to \$5 million class. The extensive engineering and supervision required for Bureau construction makes it uneconomical at the present time for these smaller projects to be constructed under present law. However, if funds were available for non-interest loans, and if the local sponsoring groups could furnish the engineering data and supervision, many fine, feasible projects would be built. That is the purpose of this legislation.

Much has been said about this being a special bill for a special region. That is true. What is being overlooked, however, is the basic reason for our reclamation act. The Federal Government, for example, owns over 70 percent of the land area of my State of Utah. We cannot tax this area. The major portion of the revenues from users of the area go into a special reclamation fund. Ten percent of the revenues go into the Federal Treasury.

Legislation establishing a program of development restricted to these 17 public land States is no more regional than leg-

islation establishing beach control projects and rivers and harbor improvement. And let it be remembered, that the reclamation States repay the Treasury the cost of the project—a rather unique penalty we pay for having too little, rather than too much water.

[Mr. SAYLOR'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the motion to recommit the bill (H. R. 4090) amending the Communications Act of 1934.

Without objection, the Clerk will read the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PELLY moves to recommit H. R. 4090 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

1. For the purpose of bringing about evaluation of reliability of device under actual operational conditions of sufficient variety and duration to determine value of the device for safety purposes;

2. To bring in line with international procedures and criteria for safety and distress; and

3. For purpose of determining alternative and more reliable methods of accomplishing the purposes of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and there were—yeas 151, nays 228, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—151

Adair
Alger
Allen, Calif.
Andresen,
August H.
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Bass, N. H.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Becker
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Bolton,
Frances P.
Bolton,
Oliver P.
Bosch
Bow
Brown, Ga.
Budge
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Chase
Chatham
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole
Coon
Coudert

Cramer
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Derounian
Devereux
Dixon
Dorn, S. C.
Ellsworth
Fjare
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Gentry
Grant
Gross
Gubser
Hand
Harrison, Nebr.
Harvey
Henderson
Hess
Hiestand
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Holmes
Holt
Hosmer
Hyde
James
Jenkins
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas
Jones, N. C.

Judd
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Pa.
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Landrum
Latham
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Love
McDonough
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Magnuson
Mailliard
Marshall
Meador
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Minshall
Mumma
Nicholson
Norblad
Osmers
Ostertag
Pelly
Phillips
Pilcher
Poff
Preston
Prouty
Ray
Robeson, Va.
Robson, Ky.
St. George

Scherer
Scrivner
Scudder
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Wis.
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.

Thompson,
Mich.
Thomson, Wyo.
Tollefson
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright

Weaver
Wharton
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Young
Younger

NAYS—228

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Anfuso
Aspinall
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barden
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowler
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Burdick
Burleson
Burnside
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carrigg
Celler
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chudoff
Clark
Colmer
Cooper
Corbett
Cretella
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Dies
Dingell
Dodd
Dollinger
Dondero
Donohue
Dorn, N. Y.
Doyle
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Forrester

Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gordon
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Griffiths
Hagen
Haley
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Hays, Ark.
Hayworth
Hébert
Herlong
Heseltun
Hill
Hollifield
Holland
Holtzman
Hope
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kearney
Kee
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knutson
Lanham
Lankford
Lesinski
Long
McCarthy
McCormack
McCulloch
McDowell
McGregor
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Mahon
Matthews
Metcalfe
Mills
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Norrell

O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Passman
Patterson
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pillion
Poage
Polk
Powell
Price
Priest
Quigley
Rabaut
Radwan
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Riley
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Sadlak
Saylor
Schenck
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tumulty
Udall
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Walter
Watts
Whitten
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Willis
Winstead
Withrow
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Zablocki
Zelenko

NOT VOTING—53

Allen, Ill.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Bell
Bonner
Boykin
Buckley
Carnahan
Christopher
Cooley
Davidson
Diggs
Dolliver
Donovan

Dowdy
Eberharter
Gamble
George
Gwinn
Hale
Halleck
Hays, Ohio
Healey
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Horan
Jackson
Kelley, Pa.

Lane
McConnell
McIntire
McMillan
Martin
Mason
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.
Morrison
Nelson
O'Hara, Minn.
Patman
Rains
Reece, Tenn.

Reed, N. Y.	Schwengel	Thompson, La.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Scott	Thornberry
Richards	Simpson, Pa.	Westland
Rivers	Sisk	Wickersham

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Carnahan against.
Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Rains against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Morrison against.
Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. George for, with Mr. Davidson against.
Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Healey against.
Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. Westland for, with Mr. Sisk against.
Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Donovan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
Mr. Christopher with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. CANFIELD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BROYHILL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WOLVERTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CRETELLA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 10964.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 66 I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EVERY AMERICAN IS ENTITLED TO A FAIR MINIMUM WAGE AND DECENT STANDARD OF LIVING

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, early in January of last year I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to \$1.35. Some of my colleagues were of the opinion my proposed hourly rate of pay was too high, but I did not because I had first-hand knowledge of the substandard wages many of my friends and constituents in South Philadelphia were receiving. And believe me they earned every penny they made because the work was not easy and in most cases none too pleasant.

Nevertheless, since I could not obtain the full support of the committee or the House for my bill, I reluctantly agreed to support and vote for the \$1 hourly minimum wage because I have learned through my 10 years' of experience here in Washington that "if you can't fight the foe and win, join them." I also remembered the trite phrase, "half a loaf is better than none."

Mr. Speaker, this coming Saturday, June 16, 1956, marks the 18th anniversary of one of the most outstanding pieces of legislation ever enacted by the Congress under the leadership of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Eighteen years ago Congress passed a law which made it the policy of the Government of the United States to eliminate substandard wages. Since the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act, this Nation has enjoyed years of prosperity and economic growth. Nevertheless, the Congress has been entirely too silent in making effective the legislation it has enacted in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Despite the increases in Federal minimum wages last year, I still find the mandatory minimum wage unrealistic and wanting. It was my firm conviction last year when the Congress passed the \$1 minimum that it was utterly inadequate. With the passage of another year the new minimum of \$1 has become even more obsolete.

Early next year when the 85th Congress convenes, I shall introduce a bill to raise the present \$1 minimum to \$1.50. I feel this action on my part will be more effective at that time since the present 84th Congress is now rushing toward adjournment within the next few weeks. I certainly do not wish to have the bill pigeonholed or hastily considered by the Committee on Education and Labor because of its vital importance to all working Americans. I submit that this proposed minimum is absolutely necessary if Congress is to attempt to make meaningful the law of the land which aims at eliminating substandard wages.

Studies by the United States Department of Labor indicate that a worker must earn more than \$2 an hour and work steadily for 52 weeks a year in order to support a family of four with a

minimum decent standard of living. Even a single woman without dependents requires, according to independent studies made by several State agencies, between a minimum of \$2,000 to \$3,000 a year to maintain a minimum decent standard of living.

In my own State of Pennsylvania, the minimum annual budget requirements of a single woman are estimated to be \$2,400. This means that a woman working 50 weeks at 40 hours would require at least \$1.20 an hour to earn the minimum requirements. That does not allow for any lay-offs, sicknesses, or other emergencies; and we know that most of the poorer paying jobs rarely offer steady employment. Thus, assuming that a single lady works 40 weeks during the year and 40 hours a week, she would require exactly \$1.50 to maintain a dignified, though very modest, living.

I am also greatly concerned with the millions of workers who have been completely denied the benefits and protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act. At present, many of the giant corporations of the country are exempt from paying their employees a minimum wage and are also not subject to payment of overtime rates. This is true in the retail trade where some of the exempt companies are doing a billion-dollar business during the year. Some of our most luxurious hotels in the Nation are also paying many of their employees below subsistence wages. The same is true of the giant agricultural establishments—I am not referring to small farms but to the factories in the field that employ many farmhands—which very frequently pay starvation wages. Similarly, employees of small telephone companies, laundries, local transit companies, construction, wholesaling, finance, insurance, and real estate are entitled to receive at least the minimum wages which are mandatory in other businesses under Federal law.

I believe that all employees in our great country are entitled to fair treatment, and the Fair Labor Standards Act should be extended to these millions of unprotected workers.

It is my firm conviction that the Nation's economy can well afford to carry the proposed higher minimum wage. As a matter of fact, I believe that it can ill afford not to do so. The economy is still, by and large, prosperous; but many dangerous soft spots are appearing and this is the case in Philadelphia, which is classified as a distressed labor area. We have been confronted with a serious and continuing unemployment problem for many years. As of January 1956, according to the United States Employment Service, the rate of unemployment in the city of Philadelphia was 6.3 percent. The national average was 4.4 percent. Additional income received by millions of workers would protect and support the prosperity and make it possible to achieve a higher level of economic activity.

Common decency also requires that a prosperous and growing economy should

July 20, 1956

14. NATURAL RESOURCES. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Public Works Committee reported with amendments S. Res. 281, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding executive policy in connection with water resources development, etc. (S. Rept. 2686). p. 12403
15. MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 12130. p. 12471
16. FOREIGN AID; IMPORTS. Sen. Malone claimed that foreign aid has been used to foster production, particularly agricultural production, which is competitive with U. S. products. p. 12490
17. RECLAMATION; FARM LOANS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 5881, to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 12445
18. EXECUTIVE PAY; RETIREMENT. Passed with amendments H. R. 7619, the executive pay bill, with additional provisions regarding retirement, etc. (pp. 12438, 12447). Rejected an amendment by Sen. Morse to make the executive pay provisions retroactive to Jan. 1, 1956 (p. 12465). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Russell to decrease from 275 to 145 the additional major positions in the Defense Department, etc. (p. 12460). Senate conferees were appointed (p. 12469).

As passed, the bill includes executive pay items for this Department as follows: Secretary, \$25,000; Under Secretary, \$21,000; Assistant Secretaries, Administrator of CSS, Administrator of REA, and General Counsel, \$20,000; heads of ARS, SCS, FEA, FS, and FIC, \$17,500; certain scientists on foot-and-mouth disease work, \$19,000 (now \$15,000); all GS-18 positions, \$16,000; and all GS-17 positions, an additional step at \$14,835. Allocates the positions of 7 directors of CSS commodity offices at GS-16. Authorizes allocation of 3 positions as Deputy ARS Administrator at GS-18. Provides for Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of the General Counsel, with a provision that the existing position shall be abolished effective upon appointment and qualification of a General Counsel or Apr. 1, 1957, whichever is earlier.

The bill provides for certain positions of particular interest to this Department as follows: Budget Bureau Director, Comptroller General, ODM Director, \$22,500; Civil Defense Administrator, GSA Administrator, FCA Governor, \$21,000; Chairman of Civil Service Commission, Chairman of Council of Economic Advisers, \$20,500; Deputy Director of Budget Bureau, \$20,500; Assistant Directors of Budget Bureau, Archivist, Director of National Science Foundation, members of CSC, \$20,000.

Title II of the bill provides that the term of office of each Civil Service Commissioner shall be 6 years, on a staggered-term basis, and that one of the commission members (instead of the Executive Director) shall be responsible for administration, if present during the absence of the Chairman.

Title IV is a revision of the Civil Service Retirement Act. It is a modification of S. 2875, the Johnston retirement bill which was recently passed by the Senate.

supplemental

19. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President various/appropriation estimates for 1957 (S. Doc. 143); to Appropriations Committee. p. 12402 (For items of interest to USDA, see item 66, this Digest.)
20. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment S. 3957, to amend the act authorizing exchange and amendment of certain farm units on Federal irrigation projects in order to limit the time during which applications may be made (S. Rept. 2685). p. 12403

Passed without amendment S. 3728, to authorize the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Tex. p. 12420

21. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported without amendment S. J. Res. 197, authorizing the President to proclaim the week of Oct. 22, 1956, as National Transportation Week (S. Rept. 2698). p. 12403
The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee agreed to recommend that the Senate accept the House amendments to S. 898, the truck trip leasing bill. p. D846
22. WORLD TRADE FAIR. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 604, authorizing the President to invite the States and foreign countries to participate in the U. S. World Trade Fair. This measure will now be sent to the President. p. 12422
23. FARM-CITY WEEK. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 317, designating the week of Nov. 16, 1956, as National Farm-City Week (S. Rept. 2702). p. 12504
24. PATENTS. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. R. 2128, to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the armed forces or by production controls (S. Rept. 2704). p. 12504
25. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. It was agreed that the calendar will be called Mon., and it was announced that the second supplemental appropriation bill will be considered when reported. pp. 12424, D851

BILLS INTRODUCED - July 20

26. BUDGET BUREAU. S. J. Res. 199, by Sen. Knowland, to authorize an additional position of Assistant Director of the Budget Bureau; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
27. ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES. S. 4262, by Sen. Wiley, to make it a Federal offense to attack, etc., certain HEW personnel engaged in enforcing food and drug and public health laws; to Judiciary Committee. Remarks of author. p. 12406
28. CONTRACTS. S. 4260, by Sen. Kennedy, to make various changes in the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Remarks of author. p. 12405
29. LIBRARIES; PUBLICATIONS. H. R. 12325, by Rep. Hays, Ohio, "to constitute certain libraries as designated depositories of Government publications"; to House Administration Committee.
30. TEXTILES. H. R. 12332, by Rep. Smith, Miss., to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX - July 20

31. FLOOD CONTROL. Rep. Weaver inserted a Saturday Evening Post article describing a flood control project at Lincoln, Nebr. p. A5715
32. FARM HOUSING LOANS; Extension of remarks of Rep. Hays, Ohio, commending the farm housing provisions of the omnibus housing bill and criticizing the

MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE JUDICIARY FROM 3 TO 5 P. M. TODAY, FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I send a proposed unanimous-consent agreement to the desk and ask that the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be read by the clerk.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be authorized, upon call by the chairman, to meet during the session of the Senate from 3 p. m. to 5 p. m., on the afternoon on Friday, July 20, 1956, for the purpose of considering only the bills which were listed on page 12295 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, July 19, when unanimous consent was granted the Judiciary Committee to meet this morning. The said bills are to be called up and considered in the order designated by the chairman and any amendments thereto shall be germane within the judgment of the chairman of the committee. Any other bills, nominations or motions can be considered by unanimous consent of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTATION OF FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of May 23, 1956, pp. 7961-7962, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation and to ask some questions of the Senator from New Mexico with respect to the conference report.

I was one of the conferees on this measure. I also had a bill which would have authorized the same type of program. There were a number of other bills, and eventually we worked out the committee bill. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. The committee bill merged the best features of all the bills presented, and this is the measure which finally went to conference. Substantially the same provisions are in the conference report as were in the bill when it passed the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Utah had a bill, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] had a bill, and the

Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] had some suggestions to make. We worked them over and came out with a bill containing those provisions.

Mr. WATKINS. It was a bipartisan effort.

Mr. ANDERSON. It was a bipartisan effort, in which we all joined.

Mr. WATKINS. Under the circumstances, it had to do with the passage of the watershed amendment. Does the Senator from New Mexico see any possible conflict between the two measures?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. The small projects bill will be chiefly utilized in the reclamation States. The other bill will be utilized in the remaining areas of the country. The two bills are more or less companion measures. The small projects bill should be passed, because it is very essential to the Western States.

Mr. WATKINS. The Poage bill, so-called, is applicable all over the United States, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to say, if I may, that this bill marks a period of great progress in reclamation and water development not only in the West, but throughout the United States. For many years the people of the West have desired this kind of legislation so that small projects which are not under consideration by the Bureau of Reclamation may receive some attention. Many of them are difficult to have built. They require long-term financing and it is difficult to get the money. That is one reason why the people wanted legislation to take care of the smaller projects which would have an overall effect which is very important to the economy of the West.

I am very happy that the small projects bill has been reported and is now before the Senate for final approval. I think a splendid job was done, particularly by the Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation, and I am happy to have been associated with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico in working out the program.

Mr. ANDERSON. We were all very happy to have the Senator from Utah associated with us.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I wish to join in commending the Senator from New Mexico. This is a very important measure to all the States in the West. Under the provisions now in the conference report, it is applicable to the reclamation States in the West; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. BARRETT. The bill provides that local organizations shall pay not to exceed 25 percent of that part of the costs which are allocable to nonreimbursable items.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. BARRETT. I think it is a splendid piece of legislation and will do a great deal for the development of the West.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I simply wish to associate myself with the remarks just made. I think this is a splendid piece of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day the eminent Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] called up a conference report on the Small Projects Reclamation Act. At the time the conference report was agreed to, I was not on the floor, although I had given notice that I wished to be notified when the conference report was brought up. Through an unavoidable error, that was not done. The Senator from New Mexico is perfectly innocent in the matter. He should in no sense be blamed for it. But the truth is that the conference report was agreed to with a very small attendance of Senators on the floor, and I did not have an opportunity to inquire about the bill as I had hoped to do.

I have had a private conversation with the Senator from New Mexico. I am now delighted to see that he has just come on the floor. I would appreciate it if, out of order, I might have the opportunity to ask some questions of the Senator from New Mexico with particular reference to the 160-acre limitation provision.

Is my understanding correct that when the small projects reclamation bill passed the Senate, it included an amendment, sponsored by the Senator from Illinois, which provided that the present 160-acre limitation should be continued?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct; that provision was in the bill, and the conference report preserved the 160-acre principle as to all new land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The wording, however, which the Senator from Illinois inserted, was eliminated; is not that true? I do not find it in the bill as it has come back from conference.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the exact language which the Senator from Illinois placed in the bill was eliminated, but I am certain when I say to him that on all new land which will be brought in by the Small Projects Act the 160-acre limitation will apply.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is, land which previously had not received irrigation water?

Mr. ANDERSON. Land which never had been irrigated. As to land which has been irrigated previously, of course, Congress has had a fairly consistent practice of not applying the 160-acre limitation to such tracts.

I call the attention of the able Senator from Illinois to the fact that in some cases there has been an attempt to limit the acreage. In this particular instance, for his information, I may say that if the area exceeds 160 acres, then there must be a special payment of interest, beyond the 160 acres, during the entire period, at the rate which the Government is paying for its money, so long as that money is furnished. That will tend to discourage the use of this type of water on supplemental land. That applies to everything over 160 acres.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for that statement. This is at least an improvement over some procedures.

But is not the term "supplemental water" frequently abused? Is it not true that as to certain land, notably in the Central Valley of California, water will be pumped from subsurface deposits, and then when water is brought out through the irrigation ditches, that water is said to be supplemental water, and the water is then brought down from the mountains through the irrigation ditches, freed from the 160-acre limitation? In this way the taxpayers' money is used to help big and not small farmers.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not able specifically to answer the question. I believe more water is used as surface water, perhaps, in the Central Valley project than anywhere else; but the problem in the Central Valley project is sometimes to get rid of excess water, not to acquire new water.

I must say to the Senator from Illinois that the problem of the Central Valley project in California has been extremely complex; it is not like anything else in the United States. But I point out to him that in some of the legislation which has been passed, provision was made that the water might be supplied without interest up to 480 acres. In the case of the Big Thompson project, in Colorado, there was no restriction whatever on supplemental water; the area could go up to 2,000 acres, if that was desired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That provision, I might say, was adopted over the objection of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON. It was the will of Congress; but I point out to the Senator that we have come a long way toward meeting his objection. We have come from the several thousand acres provided in the Big Thompson to 480 acres in the San Luis; and from the 480 acres in the San Luis, we came to 160 acres in this bill. The bill meets exactly the 160-acre limitation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But on supplemental water one can go up to 480 acres in this bill provided he pays the interest.

Mr. ANDERSON. In this bill he will start to pay interest at 160 acres, whereas in the San Luis project there was an exemption up to 480 acres. No interest was paid up to 480 acres. So the bill is as close to a 160-acre limitation as it can come and still recognize supplemental water rights.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The 160-acre limitation, which was placed in the original Reclamation Act by Senator Newlands, of Nevada, and which was approved, as I remember it, by President Theodore Roosevelt, is basic to our water policy; namely, that the Government should make these expenditures in order to build up small farms rather than huge farms.

Mr. ANDERSON. Precisely; but I may say to the Senator from Illinois that the original Reclamation Act was related to areas in regions where the climate was extremely favorable, and 160 acres was sufficient for a farm. But in the areas at higher levels, where there is a short growing season and a rather limited time in which to grow a crop, the Bureau of Reclamation itself has recognized that the 160-acre limitation is not workable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The regions at higher altitudes, having short growing seasons, are the regions in which probably there should be no irrigation projects. They are regions which grow forage crops, and in some cases fruits; but they do not have the high yields per acre of the low altitudes in the Salt River Valley, the Central Valley, and the Imperial Valley.

I have noticed that the reclamation advocates are always willing and anxious to extend the 160 acres, but are never willing to contract it. In the low altitudes, where citrus fruit is grown, one can make a very good living on 20, 30, or 40 acres.

The so-called 160-acre limitation—which is really a 320-acre limitation, because a man's wife also will be given 160 acres—provides riches beyond dreams of avarice for those in the lush valleys I have mentioned. Nevertheless, there is never any proposal to reduce the acreage limitations in those areas. No; the proposal is to extend the acreage limitation, wherever that can be done. The principle of flexibility works only one way.

I should like to ask one final question. There is a water shortage not merely in the so-called irrigation States, but there is also a great water shortage all over the country, and many authorities, such as Professor Sears, now of Yale, formerly of the University of Oklahoma, and who is a great geographer and an expert on climate, maintains that a much larger increase in agricultural production can be obtained by irrigating the Middle West than by irrigating the Southwest; and that the added yield from 5 or 6 inches more water in Illinois would be far more effective than would 12 inches of water on the barren sands of New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say to the Senator from Illinois that that statement is perfectly correct, and that is probably why the delta of the Mississippi, one of the richest of all the farmlands in the world, has turned to irrigation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the bill confine itself to the irrigation States, or does it permit the small irrigation projects to be constructed in States to the east of the so-called irrigation area?

Mr. ANDERSON. I can answer the Senator in this way: There were two bills, this bill and the Poage bill. The provisions were contained at one time in one bill. Then it was deemed undesirable to pass it in that form, because one agency administers the provisions of the law for the so-called irrigation States, and the Poage bill was passed for the other States. The bill passed the Senate this morning.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has it passed the House?

Mr. ANDERSON. It has passed the House.

MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE PROTECTION OF CHILDHOOD

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 664 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Foreign Relations is discharged from the consideration of House Joint Resolution 664, which will be read by title.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 664) to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood and authorizing an appropriation therefor was read twice by title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 664) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 195 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate Joint Resolution 195 is indefinitely postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1777. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to authorize common carriers to carry a disabled person requiring an attendant and such attendant at the usual fare charged for one person;

S. 2572. An act to authorize the interchange of lands between the Department of Agriculture and military departments of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; and

S. 3832. An act to provide for the disposal of the Government-owned synthetic rubber research laboratories at Akron, Ohio.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5337) to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable commodities.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. GREGORY, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. JENKINS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the

Public Law 984 - 84th Congress
Chapter 972 - 2d Session
H. R. 5881

AN ACT

All 70 Stat. 1044.

To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the purpose of this Act is to encourage State and local participation in the development of projects under the Federal reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in the development of similar projects in the seventeen western reclamation States by non-Federal organizations.

Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956.

Definitions.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "construction" shall include rehabilitation and betterment.

(b) The term "Federal reclamation laws" shall mean the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

43 USC 371 note.

(c) The term "organization" shall mean a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a conservancy district, irrigation district, water users' association, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar organization which has capacity to contract with the United States under the Federal reclamation laws.

(d) The term "project" shall mean (i) any complete irrigation undertaking, including incidental features thereof, or distinct unit of such an undertaking or a rehabilitation and betterment program for an existing irrigation project, authorized to be constructed pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws and (ii) any similar undertaking proposed to be constructed by an organization. The term "project" shall not include any such undertaking, unit, or program the cost of which exceeds \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That any project, the estimated cost of which is more than \$5,000,000 but less than \$10,000,000, may qualify under this Act if the applicant organization is ready, able, and willing to finance otherwise than by loan or grant under this Act all costs in excess of the amount of the loan or grant which would be made under this Act if the estimated construction cost were \$5,000,000: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this definition shall preclude the making of a grant not in excess of \$5,000,000 in accordance with the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of this Act, to organizations whose proposed projects qualify for the same but which are not applicants for a loan under this Act: *And provided further*, That nothing contained in this Act shall preclude the making of more than one loan or grant, or combined loan and grant, to an organization so long as no two such loans or grants, or combinations thereof, are for the same project, as herein defined.

(e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the benefits provided in this Act shall submit a proposal therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a payment of \$1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining the proposal.

Proposals.

SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project which has not theretofore been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail comparable to those included in preauthorization reports required for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been submitted for review by the States of the drainage basin in which the project is located in like manner as provided in subsection (c), section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), except that the review may be limited to the State or

58 Stat. 889.
33 USC 701-1.

States in which the project is located if the proposal is one solely for rehabilitation and betterment of an existing project; and shall include a proposed allocation of capital costs to functions such that costs for facilities used for a single purpose shall be allocated to that purpose and costs for facilities used for more than one purpose shall be so allocated among the purposes served that each purpose will share equitably in the costs of such joint facilities.

(b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that the organization already holds or can acquire all lands and interests in land (except public and other lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject to disposition by him) and rights, pursuant to applicable State law, to the use of water necessary for the successful construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this Act such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided*, That the contribution of any applicant organization shall not be required to be in excess of 25 per centum of the costs of the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects.

Contracts.

(c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appropriate State agency designated by him) to be financially feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as provided in section 5; but no such contract shall be executed by the Secretary prior to sixty calendar days (which sixty days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain) from the date on which the project proposal has been submitted to both branches of the Congress for consideration by the appropriate committees thereof, and then only if neither such committee, by committee resolution and notification in writing to the Secretary, disapproves the project proposal within such period: *Provided*, That if both such committees, in the same manner and prior to the expiration of such period, approve the project proposal, then the Secretary may proceed to execute the contract: *Provided further*, That in the event either committee disapproves the project proposal, the Secretary shall not proceed further unless the Congress has approved the same. The Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this Act, may reserve from use or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within his administrative jurisdiction and subject to the disposition by him and which are required for use by the project. Any such reservation shall expire at the end of two years unless the repayment contract provided for in section 5 of this Act shall have been executed.

Consideration
by Congress.

Land reser-
vations.

Consideration
of need, etc.

(d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to financial feasibility, emergency, or urgent need for the project, whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irrigation water for an existing irrigation project, whether the proposal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irrigation. All project works and facilities constructed under this

Act shall remain under the jurisdiction and control of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of the repayment contract.

SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this Act shall set out, among other things— Contract re-
quirements.

(a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(b) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded the organization and the time and method of paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1) the sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available; (2) interest, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, by estimating the average annual yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations or prices during the month of May preceding the fiscal year in which the loan is made, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of such month of May, and by adjusting such estimated average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on which the contract is executed, on that pro rata share of the loan which is attributable to furnishing irrigation benefits in each particular year to land held in private ownership by any one owner in excess of one hundred and sixty irrigable acres; and (3) in the case of any project involving an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or commercial power produced as an element of the project and incidental to its full development, interest on the unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the loan at a rate as determined in (2) above;

(d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable functions is made, in accordance with regulations with respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal department or agency primarily concerned with those functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such regulations, for operation by the United States or for repayment to the United States of the amount of any such grant;

(e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as aforesaid. The liability of the United States under any contract entered into pursuant to this Act shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the same, and every such contract shall so recite; and

(f) provisions conforming to the preference requirements contained in the proviso to section 9 (c) of the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1193), if the project produces electric power for sale.

SEC. 6. Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project which has theretofore been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall be made in like manner as a proposal under

53 Stat. 1195.
43 USC 485h.

section 4 of this Act, but the Secretary may waive such requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of that section as he finds to be duplicative of, or rendered unnecessary or impossible by, action already taken by the United States. Upon approval of any such proposal by the Secretary he may negotiate and execute a contract which conforms, as nearly as may be, to the provisions of section 5 of this Act.

Information
from Federal
agencies.

SEC. 7. Upon request of an organization which has made or intends to make a proposal under this Act, the head of any Federal department or agency may make available to the organization any existing engineering, economic, or hydrologic information and printed material that it may have and that will be useful in connection with the planning, design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the project concerned. The reasonable cost of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the cost of making and administering any loan under this Act shall, to the extent that they would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 5 of this Act unless they are otherwise paid for by the organization.

16 USC 661-
666c.

SEC. 8. The planning and construction of projects undertaken pursuant to this Act shall be subject to all procedural requirements and other provisions of the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080).

SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Appropriation.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall advise the Congress promptly on the receipt of each proposal referred to in section 3, and no contract shall become effective until appropriated funds are available to initiate the specific proposal covered by each contract. All such appropriations shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under this Act, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided.

Short title.

SEC. 11. This Act shall be a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws and may be cited as the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956.

Separability.

SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person, organization, or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to persons, organizations, or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

Approved August 6, 1956.

3540E

U.S.D.A.
SEA/TIS
LAW LIBRARY
ROOM 1406 SOUTH
WASHINGTON D.C. 20250

